THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

616933

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

7 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CLXXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THURSDAY, TWENTY-FIFTH DAY OF JULY, 1907, TO TUESDAY, SIXTH DAY OF AUGUST, 1907.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1907.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_july-25-august-6-1907_179

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41 GEO. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42 GEO. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 GEO. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 GEO. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 GEO. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 GEO. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 GEO. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 GEO. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16	7 GEO. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

EIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(NINTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(TENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1832
— 9 — 14	3	—	1831

(ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
— 21 — 25	5	—	1834

(TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
— 31 — 35	7	—	1836
— 36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
— 45 — 50	2	—	1839
— 51 — 55	3	—	1840
— 56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
— 60 to 65	5	—	1842
— 66 — 71	6	—	1843
— 72 — 76	7	—	1844
— 77 — 82	8	—	1845
— 83 — 88	9	—	1846
— 89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(FIFTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
— 96 to 101	11	—	1848
— 102 — 107	12	—	1849
— 108 — 113	13	—	1850
— 114 — 118	14	—	1851
— 119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(SIXTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
— 124 to 129	16	—	1853
— 130 — 135	17	—	1854
— 136 — 139	18	—	1855
— 140 — 143	19	—	1856
— 144	20	—	(a) 1857

(SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
— 148 — 151	21	—	1858
— 152 — 153	22	—	(a) 1859

(EIGHTEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
— 156 — 160	23	—	1860
— 161 — 164	24	—	1861
— 165 — 168	25	—	1862
— 169 — 172	26	—	1863
— 173 — 176	27	—	1864
— 177 — 180	28	—	1865

(NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
— 185 — 189	30	—	1867
— 190 — 193	31	—	1867-8

(TWENTIETH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
— 199 — 203	33	—	1870
— 204 — 208	34	—	1871
— 209 — 213	35	—	1872
— 214 — 217	36	—	1873

(TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
— 222 — 226	38	—	1875
— 227 — 231	39	—	1876
— 232 — 236	40	—	1877
— 237 — 242	41	—	1878
— 243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
— 250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
— 257 — 265	44	—	1881
— 266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
— 274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
— 276 to 283	46	—	1883
— 284 — 292	47	—	1884
— 293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(TWENTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
— 310 to 321	50	—	1887
— 322 — 332	51	—	1888
— 333 — 340	52	—	1889
— 341 — 348	53	—	1890
— 349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	...55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	...57	—	... 1893-4
—	22 — 29	...57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	...58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	...59	—	... 1895-6
—	45 — 52	...60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	...61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	...62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	...63	—	1900
—	84	... 63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	...64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	...1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	...1901
—	101 ...	1 & 2	—	...1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	...1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	...1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	...1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	...1905

(TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	EDWARD VII.	...1906
Vol.	169 to 179	7	„ „	...1907

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, DECEMBER 1905.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
    Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
    Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
    Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
    War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
    India Office——Rt. Hon. John Morley, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon. Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. R. McKenna, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——C. E. Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Portsmouth.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——Thomas Lough, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. E. Robertson, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——H. E. Kearley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——Dr. Macnamara, M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Walter Runciman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
- J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
- Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
- Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
- J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
- Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Fisher.
- Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
- Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. Jackson.
- Rear-Admiral F. S. Inglefield.

Army Council——
- The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
- General Hon. Sir N. G. Lyttelton (Chief of the General Staff).
- General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
- General Sir W. G. Nicholson (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
- Major-General Sir J. W. Murray (Master-General of the Ordnance).
- The Under Secretary of State for War.
- The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
- *Secretary.* The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland)——T. W. Russell, Esq., M.P.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——In the Cabinet.
Attorney-General——Sir J. Lawson Walton, M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Solicitor-General——Sir W. S. ROBSON, M.P.
Paymaster-General——R. K. CAUSTON, Esq., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl BEAUCHAMP.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of GRANARD.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl GRANVILLE.
- Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
- Lord ACTON.
- Lord COLEBROOKE.
- Lord SUFFIELD.
- Lord HERSCHELL.
- Lord FARQUHAR.

Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR.
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of BREADELBANE, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord KINNAIRD.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord DUNEDIN.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——The Earl of LIVERPOOL.
Controller——Major LAMBART.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R CHERRY, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks ——Hon. A. McDonnell ; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs) ; H. P. St. John, Esq. ; V. M. Biddulph, Esq. ; Hon. E. A. Stonor ; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq. ; C. Headlam, Esq. ; J. B. Hotham, Esq. ; E. C. Vigors, Esq. ; A. Tennyson, Esq. ; G. D. Luard, Esq. ; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stott.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq. ; Clerk ——H. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. W. Bradshaw.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart. ; S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq. ; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq. ; H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq.
Junior Clerks——F. C. Bramwell, Esq. ; W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; W. P. Johnston, Esq. ; J. Barlow, Esq. ; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour ; R. N. Bailey, Esq. ; G. F. M. Campion, Esq. ; S. De la Poer Beresford, Esq. ; H. S. Green, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B
Trainbearer——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Messenger——Mr. W. HOLT.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE Esq
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq.
    Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART : Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURREY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON, Mr. G. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. J. GUYATT.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY, W. MACDONALD, W. R. BRIMSON.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. HART and G. FRY.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXXIX.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1907.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 25th JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^{a}; agreed to: Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 1

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons .. 1

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill (CHELMSFORD ORDER); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill (Norwich Order); London County Council (General Powers) Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

D. Sutherland,
E. Dartrey (chairman),
L. Abinger,
L. Seaton,
L. Armstrong;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitons referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills .. 1

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill.—

House in Committee (according to order): Bills reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next .. ..

Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle Schoolroom, etc.) Charity Bill; Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next .. ..

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway (General Powers) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Borthwick and the Lord Oriel (*V. Massereene*) be proposed to the House as members of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Manners and the Lord Lyveden read, and agreed to .. .. ..

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 529. Gibraltar (Report for 1906) .. ..

AUSTRALIA.—Report upon the conditions and prospects of British trade in Australia, by the Advisory Committee on Commercial Intelligence of the Board of Trade. Based upon information collected by their Commissioner, Mr. R. J. Jeffray .. ..

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—List of public elementary schools and certified efficient schools in Wales (including Monmouthshire) on 1st August, 1906 ..

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Report of proceedings at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888. Tuesday, 2nd July, 1907 .. .. ..

ASTRONOMER ROYAL (GREENWICH OBSERVATORY).—Report of the Astronomer Royal to the board of visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, read at the annual visitation of the Royal Observatory, 8th June, 1907 ..

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3869. Egypt (Alexandria).
No. 3870. France (St. Pierre and Miquelon).
No. 3871. United States (Finances of the United States for the year 1906).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. ..

Lights on Vehicles Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Donoughmore .. ..

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Viscount St. Aldwyn .. ..
Lord Avebury .. ..
Earl Russell .. ..
Earl Beauchamp .. ..

July 25.] Page

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Weardale .. 8

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Weardale.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury .. 9

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Married Women's Property Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor .. 10

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Ashbourne .. 11

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Imported Watch Cases Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed .. 12

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 12

THE MILK SUPPLY.

Lord Kenyon .. 12
Lord Allerdale .. 14
The Earl of Onslow .. 16

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION.

The Marquess of Londonderry .. 17
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury .. 28
The Lord President of the Council (The Earl of Crewe) .. 44
The Duke of Norfolk .. 53
The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) .. 57
Lord Ashbourne .. 59
Lord Stanley of Alderley .. 60
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans .. 67
Lord Herries .. 74
The Lord Bishop of Southwark .. 76
The Lord Bishop of Salisbury .. 82
The Marquess of Salisbury .. 83
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Fitzmaurice) .. 93

House adjourned at a quarter before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 25TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 10

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 10

Tees Conservancy (re-committed) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 106

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Monday next 106

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 106

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 107

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 107

York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Midland Railway Bill [Lords]; Portishead District Water Bill [Lords]; National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 107

PETITIONS.

Congo Free State.—Petition from Chorlton-cum-Hardy, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table 107

Purity of Milk Supplies (Scotland) Bill.—Petition of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, in favour; to lie upon the Table 107

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday.—Petition from Reading, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 107

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill.—Petition from Cottesmore, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 10

July 25.]

Page

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.—Petition from Ware and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table 108

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, 2nd July, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 108

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3869 to 3871 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 108

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY.—Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 108

COASTGUARD STATIONS (CLOSED).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd July; *Major Seely*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 268] 108

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 529 (Gibraltar, Report for 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 108

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, ETC., 1906–7.—Return ordered, "Of the amount received during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, in respect of each administrative county and county borough in England and Wales, for Local Taxation Licence Duties and Penalties and Forfeitures recovered in respect of such duties, and for other Duties and Payments which are directed to be dealt with in the same manner as the Local Taxation Licence Duties (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 316, of Session 1906)."—(*Dr. Macnamara*) 108

FORESHORES (SALES, ETC.).—Copy ordered, "Of Statement of the Particulars of all Cases in which the rights and interests of the Crown in the shores and bed of the sea and tidal rivers have been sold, leased, or otherwise dealt with by the Board of Trade under the Crown Lands Act, 1866, from the 1st day of January, 1902, to the 31st day of December, 1906 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 259, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*) .. 109

AUSTRALIA (BRITISH TRADE).—Copy presented, of Report upon the Conditions and Prospects of British Trade in Australia by the Advisory Committee on Commercial Intelligence of the Board of Trade [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 109

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of List of Public Elementary Schools and Certified Efficient Schools in Wales and Monmouthshire on 1st August, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 109

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PRIVATE BURIAL GROUNDS.—Question, Mr. H. Beaumont (Sussex, Eastbourne); Answer, Mr. John Burns 109

COUNTY COUNCILLOR'S EXPENSES.—Question, Mr. Rogers (Wiltshire Devizes); Answer, Mr. John Burns 109

July 25.] Pag

SOUTHERN HOSPITAL, CARSHALTON.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton; Answer, Mr. John Burns 11

BROUGHTON SCHOOL, HAMPSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 11

COTTARS RENTS IN THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 11

SCOTTISH EDUCATION GRANTS.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 11

NAVY CONTRACTS FOR CLOTHING.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Edward Robertson 11

OUTRAGES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 11

OPIUM HOUSES IN SHANGHAI.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Sir E. Grey 11

NORTHERN LIGHTS COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. J. D. White; Answer, Mr. Lloyd George 11

RAILWAY RATES AT COOKSTOWN.—Question, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 116

BELFAST OUTWORKERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 116

CLOUGHFIN LETTER DELIVERIES.—Question, Mr. Kettle; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 117

NATIONAL TELEPHONE AGREEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Mallet (Plymouth); Answer, Mr. Asquith 117

CORN DUTY.—Question, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answer, Mr. Asquith 117

INDIAN TEA.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Morley .. 118

JUDICIAL FLOGGINGS IN INDIA.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley 119

CALCUTTA OPIUM SALES.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 119

SPECIAL POLICE PROTECTION IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 119

BELFAST TRAMWAY CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 12

CASE OF ARTILLERYMAN DUNLEANY.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 12

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "TERRIBLE."—Question, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 122

ROYAL NAVAL VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 122

H.M.S. "BLAKE."—Question, Mr. Starkey (Nottinghamshire, Newark); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 123

FATALITY TO NAVAL VOLUNTEERS ON THE TYNE.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 123

WOOLWICH ARSENAL—REDUCED ESTABLISHMENT.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.) 123

ARMY CONTRACTS—BRIBERY.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 125

THE MILITIA.—Question, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Mr. Buchanan 125

TIDWORTH BARRACKS.—Question, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Mr. Buchanan .. 126

IRISH MILITIA.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Buchanan .. 125

SOLDIERS IN CIVIL EMPLOYMENT.—Question, Mr. Hudson (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 126

THE INDIAN RUPEE.—Question, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 127

PLAGUE INOCULATION IN THE PUNJAB.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. Morley 127

REPATRIATION OF CHINESE LABOURERS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland, for Mr. Churchill) 128

ASIATICS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel (for Mr. Churchill) 128

COLONIAL TARIFFS.—Question, Mr. Holt (Northumberland, Hexham); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel (for Mr. Churchill) 129

PANAMA CANAL LABOURERS.—Question, Mr. Starkey; Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel (for Mr. Churchill) 129

COLONIAL GOVERNORSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Herbert Samuel 130

LABOUR IN THE ISLANDS OF ST. THOMÉ AND PRINCIPÉ.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir E. Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 130

July 25.] Page

FREIGHTS TO BASRA.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Sir E. Grey .. 130

HAGUE CONFERENCE AND DISARMAMENT.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer, Sir E. Grey 131

KAID SIR HARRY MACLEAN.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Sir E. Grey 131

LORD CROMER.—Question, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Sir E. Grey .. 131

EGYPTIAN GARRISON IN THE SOUDAN.—Question, Mr. Kettle; Answer, Sir E. Grey 132

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Mallet (Plymouth), Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, Sir E. Grey 132

INCOME-TAX ABATEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury, for Mr. Asquith) 133

FARMER'S VEHICLES—LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Runciman (for Mr. Asquith) 133

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Runciman 134

CUSTOMS APPOINTMENTS.—Questions, Mr. C. Duncan (Barrow-in-Furness), Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs), Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.); Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow); Answers, Mr. Runciman 134

IRISH JURORS LIST—REVISION FEES.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 138

VACCINATION EXEMPTION AT CHESTER-LE-STREET.—Question, Mr. J. W. Taylor (Durham, Chester-le-Street); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 138

MILITARY DRILL IN PRISONS.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 139

PRISON TREATMENT OF LADS.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 139

SCHOOL HYGIENE CONGRESS.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford) Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouth, N.) 140

GLAMORGANSHIRE EDUCATION ESTIMATE.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. McKenna 141

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT MEDICAL BUREAU.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman; Answer, Mr. McKenna 141

MUNICIPAL SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Jowett (Bradford, W.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 141

July 25.] Page

MONMOUTHSHIRE SCHOOLS TEACHING STAFFS.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman; Answer, Mr. McKenna 142

RANELAGH FOUNDATION, WHITEFIELD, BERKS.—Question, Mr. E. Gardner (Berkshire, Wokingham); Answer, Mr. McKenna 142

MEALS FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. McKenna 143

BUILDING SCHOOL GRANT.—Question, Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 143

TRAFFIC IN TITLES.—Questions, Mr. Swift Macneill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.), Mr. Speaker 144

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON WIMBLEDON COMMON.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somerset, S.) 145

SCOTTISH AGRICULTURAL HOLDING ACT ARBITRATION.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, Sir E. Strachey 145

MAHONEY ESTATE, COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 146

MR. UPTON'S MOATE ESTATE.—Question, Sir Walter Nugent (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 146

OUTRAGES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 146

INSTRUCTION IN GARDENING IN IRISH SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 147

ABBEYLARA EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 148

GRANARD EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 148

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY SITUATION IN BELFAST.—Questions, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. Devlin (Belfast, W.), Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 149

POLITICAL PICTURES, THE "DAILY GRAPHIC" AND IRISH OUTRAGES.—Questions, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 150

GRANARD LETTER DELIVERIES.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Captain Norton (Newington, W.), for Mr. Sydney Buxton 151

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 151

APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.), Viscount Turnour; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 151

Page

SATURDAY SITTINGS.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 151

TRANSVAAL LOAN BILL.—Questions, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 152

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London), and Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 153

THE MOORE-BAILEY LETTERS.

Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 154

The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 154

Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 154

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A: Mr. Helme and Mr. Charles Nicholson (added in respect of the Public Health Bill); Mr. Partington, Mr. Nussey, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Sir Frederick Cawley, and Mr. Adkins (in respect of the Public Health Bill); and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Mr. Percy Barlow, Mr. Alden, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Marnham, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. Wills, and Mr. Hedges.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C: Colonel Long; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Bowles.

Reports to lie upon the Table 158

POST OFFICE SERVANTS.—Report from the Select Committee, with Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 266.]

Minutes of Proceedings and Appendix to be printed. [No. 266.] .. 159

NEW BILL.

Council of India Bill.—"To amend the Law as to the Council of India," presented by Mr. Secretary Morley; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 292.] 159

SUPPLY [18TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8. CLASS II.

£113,817, to complete the sum for Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, Ireland.

The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 159
Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.) 171
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) 179
Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.) 183
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 186
Mr. T. W. Russell 192
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 196
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 197
Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.) 198
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 199
Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) 201
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 201
Sir A. Acland-Hood (Somersetshire, Wellington) 201
Mr. John Redmond 202

Vote agreed to.

Resolution to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £17,756, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, and Expenses under the Inebriates Acts."

Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 202
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 206
Mr. Devlin (Belfast, W.) 207
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 209

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Chief Secretary."—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 216
Mr. George Clark (Belfast, N.) 218
Mr. Birrell 220
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 226
Mr. Byles (Salford, N.) 228
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 229

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Committee also report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

	Page
Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.)	229
The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.)	232
Sir William Anson (Oxford University)	234
Mr. Healy (Louth, N.)	235

And it being half-past Eleven of the Clock Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at half after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 26TH JULY, 1907.

COMMISSION.—The following Bills received the Royal Assent—

1. Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment.
2. Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1).
3. Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2).
4. Local Government Ireland Provisional Orders (No. 2).
5. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1).
6. Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2).
7. Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 4).
8. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5).
9. Ladybank Sewerage, Drainage, and Water Provisional Order.
10. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, &c.)
11. Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2).
12. Clyde Navigation Order Confirmation.
13. Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation.
14. Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1).
15. Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation.
16. Southend Water.
17. Burnham (Somerset) Pier.
18. Hull and Barnsley Railway.
19. Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board.
20. Brighouse Corporation.
21. King Edward's Hospital Fund for London.
22. Heywood and Middleton Water Board.
23. London United Tramways.
24. Pontypridd Urban District Council.
25. Wisbech Water.
26. United Methodist Church.
27. Great Northern and City Railway.
28. Rawtenstall Corporation.
29. Great Central Railway.
30. Devonport Corporation.
31. Tees Valley Water (Consolidation).
32. Leeds Corporation.
33. Kendal Corporation.
34. Central London Railway.
35. Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.
36. Bude Gas.
37. King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council.

Page

38. London and North Western Railway.
39. Penrith Urban District Council.
40. Worthing Gas.
41. Alton Military Hospital.
42. Electric Supply Corporation.
43. Fitzgerald's Divorce.
44. Killery's Divorce 237

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Twelve o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 26TH JULY, 1907.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE, KING'S BENCH DIVISION (ADDITIONAL JUDGE).—The Comptroller of the Household reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address as followeth :—

"I have received your Address praying that, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, an additional Judge may be appointed to the High Court of Justice in the King's Bench Division thereof, and I will issue directions in accordance with your desire" 238

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills 239

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill; Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to .. 239

Middlesbrough, Stockton on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [LORDS]; Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 239

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 239

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 239

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 239

July 26.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

CONVENT LAUNDRIES.—Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 239

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Forfar, against; to lie upon the Table 239

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Orkney, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 239

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Walkerburn, in favour; to lie upon the Table 239

MONASTIC AND CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS BILL.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 239

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAYS.—Two Petitions from Reading, for Prohibition; to lie upon the Table 240

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL.—Petition from Hertfordshire, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 240

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Brixton and other places, and Shepherd's Bush aud other places, to lie upon the Table .. 240

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (NEW CHARTERS).—Copy presented, of Charter of Incorporation of the Borough of Nuneaton, dated the 22nd July, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 240

FORESHORES (SALES, ETC.).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th July; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 269.] 240

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th July; *Sir Frederick Banbury*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 270.] 240

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3872 to 3875 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 240

EAST INDIA (BOMBAY POLITICAL DEPARTMENT).—Address for "Return showing the length of service and present pay and allowance of all Officers in the Bombay Political Department, showing the pay and allowances of the military Officers of the Department as compared with the pay and allowances of military Officers of the same length of service in the general cadre of the Indian Political Department, and as compared with the pay and allowances of Officers of the same length of service serving with their regiments." —(*Sir Seymour King*) 240

KING'S BENCH JUDGES.—Address for "Return showing, for the years 1905 and 1906, in the case of each Judge of the King's Bench Division, the number of days on which he was absent from the King's Bench Division to go on circuit and the number of days on which he sat at assizes for the trial of prisoners or of civil cases."—(*Mr. Herbert Craig*) 241

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) [Remuneration].—Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of the remuneration of any interim Sheriff Substitute appointed in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to regulate and amend the Laws and practice relating to the civil procedure in Sheriff Courts in Scotland (King's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Whiteley*) 241

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Completion of New Destroyers.—Question, Sir Berkeley Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 241

Irish Post Office Clerks and Alleged Favouritism.—Question, Mr. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 241

The Australian Commonwealth and the Companies (Colonial Registers) Act.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 242

Silver Coinage.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 242

Revenue from Taxes on Food, Drink, and Tobacco.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Asquith 243

Civil Rights of Irish National School Teachers.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 243

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.—Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Wednesday next 243

Selection [Standing Committees).—Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Shackleton; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Parker.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee C: Mr. Murphy.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George Hardy and Mr. Hedges; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Nicholls and Mr. Bennett.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Beck; and had reinstated on the Committee (previously discharged in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George White.

July 26.] Page

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Mr. Arkwright; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Sir Francis Powell.

Reports to lie upon the Table 243

United Methodist Church Bill [Lords].—Ordered, that the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee be printed. [No. 271.] .. 244

Publications.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 272.]

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 244

Business of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed; that, at the conclusion of Government Business each day, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*).

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 249
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire E.) 258
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 261
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 262
Mr. Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 266
Mr. Chaplin (Wimbledon) 267
Mr. Brace (Glamorganshire, S.) 268
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 269
Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) 269
Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton) 270
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 272
Mr. Findlay (Lanarkshire, N.E.) 274
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 274
Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs) 257
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 275
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 277
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 282
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 284
Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) 288

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 236; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 325.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 233 ; Noes, 58. (Division List No. 326.)

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed ; that, at the conclusion of Government Business each day, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put ; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11.

Butter and Margarine Bill.—Order for consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

Mr. Barrie (*Londonderry, N.*) 295
Mr. O'Shaughnessy (*Limerick, W.*) 297

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee."—(*Mr. Barrie*).

Mr. T. M. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 298
The Treasurer of the Household (*Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.*) 298
Mr. Flynn (*Cork, N.*) 298
Sir Francis Lowe (*Birmingham, Edgbaston*) 299

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 23 ; Noes, 233. (Division List No. 327.)

Bill, as amended, considered.

Sir Edward Strachey 301

New clause—

" A name shall not be approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries for use in connection with margarine or milk-blended butter if it refers to or is suggestive of butter or anything connected with the dairy interest."—(*Sir Edward Strachey*).

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time.'

Mr. T. M. Healy 302
Mr. Byles (*Salford, N.*) 303
Sir Francis Lowe 304
The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (*Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.*) 305
Mr. O'Shaughnessy 306
Mr. Flynn 306
Mr. Barrie 307
Mr. Kilbride (*Kildare, S.*) 307
Mr. Laurence Hardy 308
Mr. Stewart (*Greenock*) 308
Sir Edward Strachey 308
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 309

July 26.]

Page
Mr. Delany 309
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 309
The Solicitor-General for Scotland (Mr. Ure, Linlithgowshire) 310
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 310
Sir Edwin Cornwall (Bethnal Green, N.E.) 311
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lancashire, Horncastle) 313
Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 314
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) 314
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 315

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

Major Seely 315

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'for use in connection with,' and insert the words 'as descriptive of the substance now known as.'" —(*Major Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

Sir Edward Strachey 315
Lord R. Cecil 316
Mr. Laurence Hardy 316
Mr. T. M. Healy 316

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil 317

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'or milk-blended butter.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

Sir Edward Strachey 318
Sir Francis Lowe 318

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out the words 'other premises,' and to insert the words 'premises other than a butter factory.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. T. M. Healy 319
Mr. T. W. Russell 320

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Sir Francis Lowe 320

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned."—(*Sir Francis Lowe*).

The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. John Burns, Battersea*) 320
Mr. T. M. Healy 321
Mr. O'Shee (*Waterford, W.*) 321
Lord R. Cecil 322
Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 322
Mr. Bowles 322

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 42 ; Noes, 174. (Division List No. 328.)

Sir Francis Lowe 325
Mr. O'Shaughnessy 326

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 13, after the word 'factory,' to insert the words 'or if any milk-blended butter, which, when prepared for sale or consignment, contains more than 16 per cent. of water, is on any premises registered under this Act.' "—(*Sir Francis Lowe*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 326
Mr. Duckworth (*Stockport*) 330
Mr. A. H. Scott (*Ashton-under-Lyne*) 334
Mr. Healy 335
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 339
Major Seely 339
Mr. Ashley 340
Mr. Evans 340
Mr. John Burns 341
Sir F. Channing (*Northamptonshire, E.*) 343
Mr. Seddon 343
Mr. Harwood (*Bolton*) 344
Mr. Barrie 345
The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 346
Mr. Flavin 348
Mr. Gilhooly (*Cork County, W.*) 348
Mr. Thompson (*Somerset, E.*) 348

July 26.] Page

Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 348
Mr. John Burns 349
Mr. F. E. Smith 350

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 22 ; Noes, 133. (Division List No. 329.)

Mr. Ure 351

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 6, after the word 'import' to insert the words 'bearing the same mark or description.'"—(*Mr. Ure.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Ure 353

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 12, after the word 'laboratories,' to insert the words 'or if the person who made the analysis be called as a witness, the evidence of that person.'"—(*Mr. Ure.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Francis Lowe 353
Mr. Ure 353

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Ure 354

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 16 to 21, and to insert the words, 'and the defendant shall not be entitled to require the person who made the analysis to be called as a witness unless he shall, at least three clear days before the return day, give notice to the prosecutor that he requires his attendance, and deposit with the prosecutor a sum sufficient to cover the reasonable costs and expenses of his attendance, which costs and expenses shall be paid by the defendant in the event of his conviction.'"—(*Mr. Ure.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir Francis Lowe 354
Mr. F. E. Smith 354

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Ure 355

July 26.] *Page*

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, to leave out Subsection (5)."

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Words omitted accordingly.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 34, at end to insert—'(b) For prohibiting the use as a preservative of any substance specified in such regulations in the manufacture of butter, milk-blended butter or margarine, or for limiting the extent to which either generally, or as regards any particular substance or substances, preservatives may be used in the manufacture or sale of butter, milk-blended butter or margarine. Provided that as regards regulations made under Subsection (b) hereof the expression "Local Government Board" shall be substituted for "Board of Agriculture" in Section 4 of the said Act of 1899, and in the application of this section to Scotland "the Local Government Board" means the Local Government Board for Scotland.'"—(*Mr. John Burns.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Edwin Cornwall 356

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 35, to leave out Subsection (2)"—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question, "That Subsection (2) stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 39, to leave out from the word 'describes,' to end of clause, and insert the words 'it by any name other than "margarine" or a name combining the word "margarine" with a fancy or other descriptive name approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and printed in type not larger than the word "margarine," he shall be guilty of an offence under this Act.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Evans 357

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

> "In line 4, after the word 'than' to insert the words 'and in the same colour as.'"—(*Mr. Evans.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Proposed words, as amended, there inserted in the Bill, agreed to.

Sir Francis Lowe 357

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 5, line 9, to leave out the words 'or names.'"—(*Sir Francis Lowe.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or names' stand part of the Bill."

Sir Edward Strachey 358
Sir F. Banbury 358
Mr. F. E. Smith 35

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 115 ; Noes, 43. (Division List No. 330.)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 5, to leave out lines 18 to 21."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 5, line 23, to leave out the words 'as milk-blended butter or.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Sir Francis Lowe 36

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 6, line 9, at the end to insert the words '(3) An invoice describing an article as butter shall be deemed to be a sufficient written warranty that such article is pure butter, and shall be available as a defence under The Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, subject to the further provisions of section twenty of The Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899.'"—(*Sir Francis Lowe.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Page

Sir Edward Strachey 361
Mr. Mond (Chester) 363
Mr. T. W. Russell 364

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Telegraph (Money) Bill.—Order read, for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [22nd July], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 365
Sir F. Banbury 366
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 367
Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 367
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) 368

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill.—Consideration, not amended, (by the Standing Committee), deferred till Monday next 370

Australian States Constitution Bill [Lords].—Committee deferred till Monday next 370

Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'under and in accordance with the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 370

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out Sub-section (*b*)."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, "That the sub-section proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

July 26.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That those words be there added to the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Mr. Akers-Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine's) 373
Mr. Gladstone 373
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 374
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 375
Mr. Leif Jones 375

Amendment to the proposed Amendment to the Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, lines 35 and 36, to leave out the words 'having power to deal with the offender in respect of his original offence,' and insert the words 'before which an offender is bound by his recognisance under this Act to appear for conviction or sentence.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed to the Bill, and agreed to:—

"In page 6, line 4, to leave out the word 'two,' and insert the word 'three.'"

"In page 6, line 18, after the word 'to' to insert the words 'Ireland "Lord-Lieutenant" shall be substituted for "Secretary of State" and each division of.'"

"In page 6, line 19, to leave out the words 'a division of that district.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill—Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; read the third time, and passed 376

Vaccination Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Comittee), considered; read the third time, and passed 376

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill [Lords].—Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Attorney-General*) 376

Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 376

Municipal Milk Depôts Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 376

Patents and Designs (Consolidation) Bill.—Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*) 376

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 374

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House this day.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 29TH JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10).

Also the Certificate that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Post Office Sites.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 377

Swansea Harbour Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 377

Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments 377

Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 377

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 377

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons .. 377

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners 377

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 377

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment considered, and agreed to 377

Coventry Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 378

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Humber Conservancy Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to .. 378

July 29.] *Page*

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill; Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 378

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill.—Read 3ª (according to Order) and passed 378

Armagh Urban District Council Bill.—Bill read 3ª, with the Amendment.

The Earl of Donoughmore 378

Amendment moved

"In page 28, line 21, to leave out from '1878' to the end of the clause."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

The Chairman of Committees (*The Earl of Onslow*) 378
Lord Denman 379
The Marquess of Londonderry 380
The Earl of Mayo 381
The Earl of Camperdown 382
Lord Courtney of Penwith 382
The Earl of Donoughmore 382
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 382

Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith.*)

Earl Cawdor 383

On Question, Motion agreed to, and the further debate adjourned accordingly to Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 530. Northern Territories of the Gold Coast (Report of 1906).
No. 531. Sierra Leone (Report for 1906) 383

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Regulations for Secondary Schools (Wales) (in force from 1st August, 1907) 383

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3872. Peru (Ignitos).
No. 3873. Turkey (Baghdad).
No. 3874. Brazil (Pará).
No. 3875. Costa Rica.
No. 3876. United States.
No. 3877. France (St. Nazaire) 383

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (SCOTLAND).—Fifty-first Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland, of births, deaths and marriages in Scotland. Abstracts of 1905 384

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.—Annual Report of the President, for the year 1906–1907 384

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Report of the Commissioners, for the period from 1st April, 1906, to 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 384

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (INCORPORATION OF NUNEATON).—Charter of Incorporation of the Borough of Nuneaton, dated the 22nd of July, 1907 384

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.—Return for the year ended 31st March, 1907, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted under Rule 2 of the regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act to hold civil employment of profit under public departments.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 384

LONDON CORPORATION.—Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London, for the year 1906. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 384

Telegraph (Money) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} To-morrow.—(*The Lord Granard.*) [*Earl Granard*]. (No. 138) 384

Butter and Margarine Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and to be read 2^{a} on Thursday next.—(*The Earl Carrington.*) (No. 134) 384

Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill (No. 135); Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill (No. 136); Vaccination Bill (No. 137).—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}, and to be printed 385

KING'S BENCH DIVISION—ADDITIONAL JUDGE.

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 385

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in the King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Alverstone 388
Lord James of Hereford 392

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly: the said Address to be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.].—Order of the Day read for the House being put into Committee.

Page
July 29.]

Lord Ampthill 393

Moved, "That the House resolve itself into Committee."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Moved, "That these Amendments be agreed to."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 394
Lord Ampthill 394

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday the 6th of August next.

PUBLIC BILLS.

The Earl of Camperdown 395

Moved "That during the remainder of the present session all Bills which come from the House of Commons shall be printed in such manner as to show what parts, if any, have been passed by means of the closure."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 396
The Earl of Mayo 397
The Marquess of Lansdowne 397
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 397
Earl Cawdor 398
Lord James of Hereford 398
Lord Newton 398
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 399
Viscount Midleton 399
Lord Stanley of Alderley 399
The Earl of Camperdown 400
Lord Courtney of Penwith 401

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

THE CONGO FREE STATE.

Lord Monkswell 402

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the administration of the Congo Free State."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 412
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh 417
The Earl of Mayo 419
The Lord Bishop of Southwark 424

Page
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Fitzmaurice) .. 426
The Marquess of Lansdowne 431
The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Ripon) 435
Lord Monkswell 436
Lord Fitzmaurice 436

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Business of the House.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 437

House adjourned at half-past Eight o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 29th JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Provisional Order Bill [Lords] (Standing Order Applicable Thereto Complied With).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 437

Sunderland Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to 438

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 438

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill (King's Consent Signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed 438

North British Railway Bill [Lords] (King's Consent Signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 438

Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords] (King's Consent Signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 438

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 438

Selsey Water Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 438

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 438

Page

July 29.]

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 438

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1829, relating to Paisley Corporation," presented by Mr. Sinclair, and ordered, under Section 7 of the Act, to be considered upon Wednesday next 438

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Imported Watch-cases Bill, without Amendment.

South Wales Railway Mineral Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill, with Amendments 438

PETITION.

Weekly Rest-Day Bill.—Petition from London and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table 438

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Irish Land Commission.—Copy presented, of Report of the Commissioners for the period from 1st April, 1906, to 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 439

Queen's College (Galway).—Copy presented, of Report of the President of Queen's College (Galway) for the Session 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 439

Government Institutions (Ireland).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 10th April; Mr. Boland]; to lie upon the Table 439

Sanitary Officers in Rural Districts.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th April; Sir John Dickson-Poynder]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 273] 439

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Regulations for Secondary Schools, Wales (in force from 1st August, 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 439

Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Scotland).—Copy presented, of Fifty-first Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 439

Superannuation Act, 1887.—Copy presented, of Return for the year ended 31st March, 1907, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act, to hold civil employment for profit under Public Departments [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 274] 439

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Copies presented, of Colonial Report No. 530 (Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1906); No. 531 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 439

July 29.] *Page*

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3876 and 3877 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 440

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Chamber of London. Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 275] 440

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PROVINCIAL TELEPHONE CHARGES.—Question, Mr. Mallet (Plymouth); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 440

BUNCRANA TELEPHONE FACILITIES.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 440

SECOND BALLOTS.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. John Burns 441

DUTY ON MANUFACTURED SILVER.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Asquith 441

BOY CLERKS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 441

TRADE MARKS ON BOXES.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Runciman 442

SUGAR AND TEA DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Gwynn (Galway); Answer, Mr. Asquith 442

GUARANTEED LOANS FOR THE COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Asquith 443

SALT TAX PROSECUTION IN BOMBAY.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Morley 443

OFFICIAL VISITS TO INDIA.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 444

HERBERT ESTATE, COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 444

FAILURE OF KINVARA (GALWAY) CROPS.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 444

EDUCATION ESTIMATES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 445

DRISHANE LAND DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 446

IRISH LAND TITLES.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 446

IRISH TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 447

July 29.]

Page

War Department Marquee Contracts.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Haldane 447

Cost of Army Messing.—Question, Colonel Long (Worcestershire, Evesham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 448

Cost of Navy Messing.—Question, Colonel Long; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 448

Examination for Foreign Office Appointments.—Question, Mr. Horniman (Chelsea); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 449

Government Contracts and Fair Wages.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 450

Belfast Harbour Commissioners.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 450

Board of Works—Contracts Clause.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, Mr. Harcourt 455

Civil Service Transfers.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Runciman 456

Copper Coinage.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, Mr. Asquith 457

China and Indian Opium.—Question, Mr. H. J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth); Answer, Mr. Morley 457

Irish Board of Works Staff.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 485

Inspectors of Irish National Schools.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Birrell 458

Royal Irish Constabulary Inspectors.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Birrell 459

Whitechurch Evicted Tenant.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 456

Belturbet Evicted Tenant.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 459

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Coast and River Protection.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 460

The Coastguard.—Questions, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby), Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson 460

Naval Courts-martial.—Questions, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis), Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs), Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Speaker 461

July 29.] Page

COLONIAL NAVAL DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 461

NAVAL OFFICERS AND THE PRESS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 462

DESTROYERS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow), Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 462

CORDITE COMMITTEE.—Questions, Mr. Bellairs, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) .. 463

CAVALRY OF THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.—Questions, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.), Major Seely; Answers, Mr. Haldane 463

YEOMANRY RIFLE.—Questions, Sir Samuel Scott, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Mr. Haldane 464

TERRITORIAL ARMY-ARMING OF CAVALRY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Haldane 464

AUDIT OF GRANTS TO TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATIONS.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 465

SOLDIERS MUFTI REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Mallet (Plymouth); Answer, Mr. Haldane 465

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 465

CAVAN MILITIA BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 469

SHOEBURYNESS.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S. E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 469

ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL COLLEGE.—Questions, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answers, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Speaker 470

SCOTTISH VOLUNTEERS AND SUNDAY ENTRAINMENT.—Questions, Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs), Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Mr. Haldane 471

SCOTTISH COUNTIES AND MILITIA QUARTERS.—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 472

GOVERNMENT LANDS AT SHOEBURYNESS.—Question, Mr. Whitehead; Answer, Mr. Haldane 472

DISBANDED BATTALIONS.—Question, Mr. Clavell Salter (Hampshire, Basingstoke); Answer, Mr. Haldane 473

DEFENCES OF THE THAMES AND MEDWAY.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend), Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, Mr. Haldane 474

ROYAL ENGINEER SUBMARINE MINERS OFFICERS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Haldane 474

July 29.]

Page

TRANSVAAL LOAN.—Questions, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth), Mr. Swift Macneill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 475

TRANSVAAL PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ON CHINESE LABOUR.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 475

GAMBLING DENS IN THE FEDERATED MALAY STATES.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 475

NATIVE LABOUR ON THE RAND.—Questions, Mr. Mackarness, Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich), Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker 476

KAFFIRS AND THE RAND.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 478

PANAMA CANAL LABOUR.—Questions, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answers, Mr. Churchill 478

SOUTHERN NIGERIAN CONCESSIONS.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham) Answer, Mr. Churchill 479

AFRICAN HUT TAX.—Question, Sir E. Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Churchill 480

THE NEW HEBRIDES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Churchill 481

GREAT BRITAIN AND RUSSIA.—Questions, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester), Mr. Rees; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury, for Sir E. Grey) 481

BRITISH COMMERCIAL AGENTS.—Question, Mr. Marold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Runciman 482

UNITED STATES TARIFF ON WORKS OF ART.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Runciman 483

LONDON FLORISTS.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 483

LIGHTHOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. W. R. Rea (Scarborough); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 484

BRITISH COMMERCIAL AGENTS ABROAD.—Questions, Mr. Harold Cox; Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 484

BRITISH COMMERCIAL AGENTS IN THE COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 485

NEWBURY TRAIN SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 485

LIGHT RAILWAY BILL.—Question, Colonel A. Gardner (Herefordshire, Ross); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 486

RAILWAY COMPANIES AND IRISH BUTTER TRADE.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 487

GOVERNMENT CAPITAL.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 487

NAVIGATION AND SHIPPING RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 488

BERMONDSEY PAUPERS.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 488

LIVERPOOL GUARDIANS AND CATHOLIC POOR LAW CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Leix); Answer, Mr. John Burns 489

DARFIELD AND LOW VALLEY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash); Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 490

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Questions, Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities), Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker 490

CAITHNESS AND ORKNEY MAILS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Captain Norton (Newington, W.) for Mr. Sydney Buxton 492

TELEGRAPH MESSENGERS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answers, Captain Norton (for Mr. Sydney Buxton), Mr. Speaker 492

NATIONAL TELEPHONE CHARGES AT KENDAL.—Question, Mr. Stewart Smith Westmoreland, Kendal), Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Captain Norton (for Mr. Sydney Buxton) 493

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 494

WORCESTER ELECTION PETITION.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Sir John Walton.. 494

SHETLAND HERRING STATIONS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 494

MEDICAL RELIEF IN THE HIGHLANDS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 495

ORKNEY AND THE SMALL LANDOWNERS BILL.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 496

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES,—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 496

ARMY BILL—LORDS' AMENDMENTS.—Questions, Mr. Byles, Mr. Ashley; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 496

July 29.] *Page*

LONDON BILLS.—Questions, Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 497

SCOTTISH LOCAL VETO BILL.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 497

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE SERVANTS.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 498

BLOCKING MOTIONS.—Questions, Sir Edward Sassoon, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan), Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 498

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 499

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. William Redmond, and Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 499

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 499

Public Health (Re-Committed) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 276.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee and on re-committal), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 293] .. 501

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C: Mr. Dolan 501

Report to lie upon the Table.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Mr. Charles Craig (*Antrim, S.*) 501
Mr. T. L. Corbett (*Down, N.*) 503

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee."—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) 504
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 506
Mr. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 508
Mr. Leif Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 508
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 509

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 51 ; Noes, 249. (Division List No. 331.)

Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.) 513

New Clause—

" Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in Section 9 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, the Estates Commissioners may acquire by agreement, for the purposes of this Act, any land which is subject to an annuity under the Land Purchase Acts or the Irish Land Act of 1903, and they may create an additional annuity repayable out of such land provided that they are satisfied that the security for the repayment thereof is sufficient."

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Charles Craig 516
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 517
Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.) 518
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) .. 519
Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.) 520
Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.) 522
Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.) 522
Mr. Birrell 523
Mr. Walter Long 524
Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.) 525
Mr. Healy 526

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 78 ; Noes, 244. (Division List No. 332.)

Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 529
Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.) 533

New Clause—

" The provisions of the Lands Clauses Act, 1845, relating to the purchase and taking of lands otherwise than by agreement, are incorporated in this Act."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Cherry 535
Mr. T. L. Corbett 536
Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.) 537
Mr. Charles Craig 538
Mr. Birrell 541
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney 542
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 543

July 29.] *Page*

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 69 ; Noes, 263. (Division List No. 333.)

Mr. Ashley 547

New Clause—

> " Where any land is compulsorily purchased or taken under this Act, all sporting rights hitherto enjoyed by the vendor shall, if he so desires, remain vested in him notwithstanding such purchase."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. Gwynn 548
Mr. Cherry 548
Mr. Walter Long 548
Mr. John Redmond 549
Viscount Castlereagh (*Maidstone*) 550

New Clause and Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. John Redmond 551

New Clause—

> " No evicted tenant who has purchased a holding under the Act of 1903, or who shall purchase a holding under the said Act or under this Act, shall be liable to be adjudicated a bankrupt, or to have any of his property taken in execution, or otherwise made liable to satisfy any debt contracted or incurred by such evicted tenant prior to the date of the order vesting such holding in him."—(*Mr. John Redmond.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Birrell 552
Mr. Walter Long 552
Mr. John Redmond 553
Mr. T. M. Healy 553
Mr. Birrell 554
Viscount Castlereagh 554

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

Mr. Cherry 554
Mr. Walter Long 555

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

Mr. Charles Craig 555
Mr. Barrie 556

"The number of evicted tenants to be reinstated or supplied with new holdings under this Act is hereby limited to two thousand."—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Brought up, and read a first tim

Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Cherry 558
Mr. T. M. Healy 558
Viscount Castlereagh 558
Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington) 559
Mr. T. W. Russell 560

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 43 ; Noes, 234. (Division List No. 334.)

Mr. Charles Craig 563
Mr. T. L. Corbett 567

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the clause down to the word 'land' in line 6 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. O'Shaughnessy 568
Mr. Birrell 569
Mr. Walter Long 570
Mr. A. Roche (Cork) 573
Mr. Barrie 574

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 296 ; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 335.)

And, it being half-past Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to the order of the House of 22nd July, successively to put forthwith the Question upon any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given

Amendment made—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and if they have offered to the person appearing to them to be the owner of the land a price which appears to them to represent the fair market value

thereof, and he has not within the prescribed time accepted the offer.' " —(*Mr. Birrell.*)

mendment proposed to the Bill—

> " In page 1, line 14, after '1903,' to insert the words 'who, or whose predecessors, were evicted from their holdings before the passing of the said Act in consequence of proceedings taken by or on behalf of their landlords and.' "—(*Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.*)

Question put, " That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 301 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 336.)

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> " In page 2, line 9, at the end, to insert the words, 'For the purposes of this enactment a person shall be deemed to be a tenant notwithstanding that he may have agreed to purchase his holding, if the agreement was entered into after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and seven, and if the holding has not become vested in him as a purchaser under the Land Purchase Acts.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question put, " That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 310 ; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 337.)

Amendment made—

> " In page 3, line 27, after the word 'serve,' to insert the words 'in the prescribed manner.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Criminal Appeal Bill.—Order read, for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to the Bill on Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee) [July 19th].

Which Amendment was—

> " In page 3, line 1, to leave out paragraph (b) of Clause 3."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question again proposed, " That the words 'with the leave of the' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Akers-Douglas (*Kent, St. Augustine's*) 587
The Attorney-General (*Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.*) 587
Mr. Clavell Salter (*Hants, Basingstoke*) 588
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 589
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 590
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 591
Mr. John O'Connor (*Kildare, N.*) 592
Mr. Lyttelton (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 593
Mr. Pickersgill (*Bethnal Green, S.W.*) 594
Mr. Lane-Fox (*Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash*) 594

Page
Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.) 595
Mr. Buckmaster (Cambridge) 597
Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing) 598
Mr. Rufus Isaacs (Reading) 599
Mr. Rawlinson 602

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 200 ; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 338.)

Mr. Evans 607

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, after the word 'the,' to insert the words 'court before whom the person is convicted or of the.'"—(*Mr. Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be inserted in the Bill."

Sir John Walton 609
Mr. Lyttelton 610

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 67 ; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 339.)

Mr. Rawlinson 613
Mr. Cave 615

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 200 ; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 340.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Court of Criminal Appeal' stand part of the Bill."

Viscount Turnour 617
Mr. James O'Connor 619
Sir John Walton 620
Sir William Anson 622
Mr. Gladstone 623
Mr. Lyttelton 624
Mr. Evans 626
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 628

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The House divided :—Ayes, 151 ; Noes, 52. (Division List No. 341.)

Mr. Bottomley 631

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, at end, to add : 'Provided that any person convicted on indictment upon a charge involving sentence of death shall be entitled to appeal under this Act to the Court of Criminal Appeal

July 29.] Page

against his conviction on any ground of appeal which involves a question of law alone or a question of fact alone or a question of mixed law and fact.' "

Agreed to.

Mr. F. E. Smith (*Liverpool, Walton*) 633
Mr. Clavell Salter 636

Amendment proposed—

" In page 3, line 11, to leave out from the word 'jury' to 'or,' in line 13, and to insert the words 'is under all the circumstances unsafe or unsatisfactory.' "—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir John Walton 637
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 639
Mr. George Whiteley 640
Lord R. Cecil 641
Mr. Rawlinson 642
Sir William Anson 643
Mr. Cave 643

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 57 ; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 342.)

Mr. Rawlinson 645
Mr. Clavell Salter 647
Sir John Walton 650
Mr. Lane-Fox 656
Mr. Greenwood 657

Motion made, and Question put, "In page 3, line 25, at end, insert the words 'Provided that if the appeal shall be allowed on the ground that the verdict of the jury ought to be set aside, the Court may, in lieu of directing a verdict of acquittal, order the appellant to be re-tried on the indictment by such Court and at such time and place as shall be specified in the order, and thereupon the appellant shall be re-tried accordingly.' "

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 41 ; Noes, 116. (Division List No. 343.)

Mr. Lyttelton 659

Question put, " That the further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned."

The House divided :—Ayes, 42 ; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 344.)

Mr. Rawlinson 663
Mr. John O'Connor 664

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 29, after the word 'other,' to insert the words 'less severe.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir John Walton 665
Mr. Akers Douglas 666
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 666
Mr. Clavell Salter 667
Mr. Cave 668

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 38, to leave out Subsection (2) of Clause 5."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. John O'Connor 669
Sir John Walton 669
Mr. Bowles 671
Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) 672
Mr. Clavell Salter 672
Sir John Walton 673
Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 674
Mr. Rawlinson 674
Mr. Cave 675

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 91 ; Noes, 44. (Division List No. 345.)

Mr. Rawlinson 677

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 9, to leave out the word 'verdict' and insert the word 'finding.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'verdict' stand part of the Bill."

Sir John Walton 677

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Rawlinson 677

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 17, to leave out Subsection (4) of Clause 5."—*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'that,' in page 4, line 18, stand part of the Bill."

July 29.] Page

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Bottomley 678

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 39, after the word 'sentence' to insert the word 'only.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Rawlinson 679

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 7, after the word 'appeal' to add the words, 'or the Court that has tried the criminal.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir John Walton 679

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Rawlinson 680

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 14, after the word "of," to insert the words 'his application for leave to appeal and on the hearing of.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir John Walton 680
Mr. Bowles 681

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 30; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 346.)

Colonel Lockwood 683
Viscount Helmsley 683

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Debate be adjourned."

Mr. Gladstone 685
Mr. Lane-Fox 686

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 36; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 347.)

Mr. Cave 687

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 7, line 41, to leave out the word 'an,' and insert the words 'a successful' —(*Mr. Cave*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the word 'an' stand part of the Bill."

Sir John Walton 687

Amendment negatived.

Amendments proposed—

> "In page 8, line 19, to leave out the word 'or,' and insert the words 'and subject to any directions which the Court of Criminal Appeal may give to the contrary on any appeal, the time during which the appellant.'"
>
> "In page 8, line 25, after the word 'shall,' insert the words 'subject to any directions which may be given by the Court as aforesaid.'"—(*The Attorney-General.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Rawlinson 688

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 8, lines 27 and 28, leave out the words 'the appeal is determined' and insert the words 'the sentence is passed.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir John Walton 689

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Clavell-Salter 689
Mr. Boulton (*Huntingdonshire, Ramsey*) 690

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 10, line 18, to leave out the words 'to give leave to appeal.'"—(*Mr. Salter.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir John Walton 691

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, line 6, after the word 'being,' to insert the words 'the Registrar of the Court of Criminal Appeal.'"

"In page 12, line 2, after the word 'inquisitions,' to insert the words 'and in cases where a person is dealt with by a court of quarte sessions as an incorrigible rogue under the Vagrancy Act, 1824.'"

"In page 12, line 7, to leave out the word 'appeals,' and insert the words 'Notwithstanding anything in any other Act, an appeal shall lie.'"

"In page 12, line 7, to leave out the word 'convictions,' and to insert the words 'a conviction.'"

"In page 12, line 7, to leave out the word 'indictments,' and insert the word 'indictment.'"—(*The Attorney-General.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 12, line 8, after the word 'law,' to insert the words 'whether tried in the King's Bench Division, or at the assizes, or at quarter sessions.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 12, line 9, to leave out from the word 'river,' to the word 'in,' in line 10, and to insert the words 'in whatever Court the indictment is tried.'"

"In page 12, line 10, to leave out the word 'convictions,' and insert the word 'conviction.'"

"In page 12, line 11, after the word 'action,' to insert the words 'tried at assizes.'"

"In page 13, line 3, to leave out the words 'twenty-fifth day o December,' and to insert the words 'eighteenth day of April.'"

"In page 13, line 3, to leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'eight.'"—(*The Attorney-General.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read a third time."—(*Mr. Attorney-General.*)

Mr. Pike Pease 692
Mr. Gladstone 692
Mr. Akers-Douglas 692

July 29.] *Page*

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 102 ; Noes, 28. (Division List No. 348.)

Bill read the third time and passed.

Irish Council Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn."—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

Sir N. Acland-Hood 693
Mr. George Whiteley 694

Question put, and agreed to.

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Order be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn."

Col. Lockwood 695
Mr. George Whiteley 695

Question put, and agreed to.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 695

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 695

Telegraph (Construction) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 695

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 695

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) [REMUNERATION]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That it is expedient to authorise the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of the remuneration of any interim Sheriff Substitute appointed in pursuance of any Act of the present session to regulate and amend the laws and practice relating to the civil procedure in Sheriff Courts in Scoltand."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Mr. Younger 696

The Resolution was agreed to, and was reported to the House.

July 30.] *Page*

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported this day.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1905–6.

Committee to consider the Surpluses and Deficits upon Navy and Army Grants for 1905–6, and the application of Surpluses to meet Expenditure not provided for in the grants for that year, this day—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented respectively on the 18th and 20th February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of this instant July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes before Seven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 30TH JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 697

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Tees Conservancy Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 697

Sunderland Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 697

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway General Powers Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Camperdown be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Brougham and Vaux; and that the Earl of Camperdown be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to 697

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS, 1906).—Vol. XLI., Part III. Prices and supplies of corn, live stock, and other agricultural produce 697

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND), 1906.

Part I. Criminal Statistics.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 697

July 30.] *Page*

EARL OF CROMER.—His Majesty's most gracious message of Wednesday last considered (according to Order).

The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 697

Moved, "That an humble address of thanks and concurrence be presented to His Majesty."—(*Marquess of Ripon.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne 700

On Question, Motion agreed to *nemine dissentiente*; the said address to be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

Criminal Appeal Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday next; (The Lord Chancellor). [No. 139] 702

Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill [H.L.

House in Committee (according to Order.)

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Lord Avebury 702

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 2 and to insert the following new clause, viz.: 2—(1.) Where either before or after the passing of this Act a company has redeemed any debentures previously issued, the company, unless the articles of association of the company or the conditions of issue otherwise provide, or unless the debentures have been redeemed in pursuance of any obligation on the company so to do, and not being an obligation enforceable only by the person to whom the redeemed debentures were issued, shall have power, and shall be deemed always to have had power, to keep the debentures alive for the purposes of re-issue, and where a company has purported to exercise such a power the company shall have power, and shall be deemed always to have had power, to re-issue the debentures either by re-issuing the same debentures or by issuing other debentures in their place, and upon such a re-issue the person entitled to the debentures shall have, and shall be deemed always to have had, the same rights and priorities as if the debentures had not previously been issued; (2) Where with the object of keeping debentures alive for the purpose of re-issue they have either before or after the passing of this Act been transferred to a nominee of the company, a transfer from that nominee shall be deemed to be a re-issue for the purposes of this section; (3) Where a company has either before or after the passing of this Act deposited any of its debentures to secure an advance, the debentures shall not be deemed to have been redeemed by reason only of the advance having, whilst the debentures were so deposited, been repaid."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

July 30.] *Page*

The Earl of Granard 703
Lord Avebury 703

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3 :—

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 3."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4 :—

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 4."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to, Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received to-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 140.)

Lights on Vehicles Bill.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1 :—

Earl Beauchamp 705

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'lamps' to insert the words 'in proper working order and.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

The Earl of Donoughmore 705
Earl Russell 705

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'no' and to insert the words 'if a,' and after the word 'person' to insert the words 'driving or being in charge of a vehicle is.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 :—

Lord Avebury 706

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'any,' to insert the words 'district, or any.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

The Earl of Donoughmore 706
Lord Avebury 707
Earl Beauchamp 707
Earl Russell 707

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Earl of Wemyss 708

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'place' to insert the following new subsection: '(2) The council of any county borough may, by order approved by the Secretary of State, exempt from the operation of this Act, subject to any conditions mentioned in the order, any vehicle which is not proceeding faster than a walking pace.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

Lord Clifford of Chudleigh 708
The Earl of Donoughmore 709

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Ludlow 709

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 39, after the word 'rate' insert the following new subsection: '(6) The London County Council shall within the Administrative County of London have the same powers under this section as the council of a borough have within their borough, and for the purposes of this section the county fund shall be substituted for the borough fund or rate.'"—(*Lord Ludlow.*)

The Earl of Donoughmore 709
Lord Ludlow 710
Earl Beauchamp 710
Lord Avebury 710
Lord Stanley of Alderley 711

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Earl Beauchamp 711

July 30.] Page

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 3, to insert the following new clause :—'4. The council of any county may by order exempt from the operation of this Act vehicles carrying in the course of harvesting operations any farm produce to stack or barn during such months or periods in the year as may be specified in the order, and any such orders may be made either to take effect throughout the whole county or to take effect in part only of the county.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

Viscount St. Aldwyn 712
Lord Clifford of Chudleigh 712

On Question, Amendment agreed to

Clause 4 :—

Consequential Amendment agreed to.'

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 712

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 37, after the word 'road' to insert the following sub-section :—(5) 'This Act shall not apply to Scotland.' "—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Lord Denman 713

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 4, to insert the following new clause :—'(5) In the application of this Act to Ireland, the Lord-Lieutenant shall be substituted for the Secretary of State, and the provision as to the position of the lamp, if only one lamp is provided, shall not apply in the case of a bicycle, tricycle, velocipede, or other similar machine.' "—(*Lord Denman.*)

Viscount St. Aldwyn 714

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Other clauses and preamble agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee ; and to be printed as amended. (No. 141.)

Telegraph (Money) Bill.—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 714

On Question, Bill read 2ª. Committee negatived ; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

Post Office Sites Bill.—Order of the Day for Second Reading read.

The Earl of Granard 715

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed for Tuesday next.

SECRECY OF OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS.

Viscount Esher 716
The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 719

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE AND THE NAVY.

Lord Brassey 721
The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord Tweedmouth) 725
Lord Ellenborough 730

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND.)

Lord Eversley 731
The Lord President of the Council (The Earl of Crewe) 732
The Earl of Donoughmore 732

THE COURSE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 732
The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Ripon) 734
Lord Newton 737

Fatal Accidents (Damages Bill) [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the law with respect to the assessment of damages under the Fatal Accidents Act—was presented by the Lord Courtney of Penwith; read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Monday next. (No. 142) 737

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till to-morrow, at a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 30TH JULY, 1907

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Aberdeen Corporation Electricity Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.. 738

Midland Railway Bill [LORDS]; Portishead District Water Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 738

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.. 738

July 30.] *Page*

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 738

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 738

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow 738

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 738

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 738

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 738

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill, without Amendment.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill; Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bills [Lords]; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [Lords]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].

Amendment to:—Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [Lords]; without Amendment 739

City of London Union of Parishes Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 739

Private Bills (Group K).—Mr. Arthur Stanley reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills. That, for the convenience of parties the Committee had adjourned until Saturday, at half-past Ten of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 739

July 30.] Page

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Rhynie, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 739

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Three Petitions from Reading, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 739

VACCINATION ACTS.—Petition from Derby, for repeal; to lie upon the Table .. 739

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.—Petition from Pirbright, in favour; to lie upon the Table 739

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CLOSING ORDERS).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 2nd May; *Mr. Crooks*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277] 740

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Copy presented, of Agricultural Statistics, 1906. Vol. XLI. Part III. Prices and Supplies of Corn, Live Stock, and other Agricultural Produce [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 740

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1906. Part 1. Criminal Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 740

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS]—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 740

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

REGULATION OF SHIPBUILDING WORK.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 740

THE SLAVE TRADE IN CENTRAL AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 740

REDUCTIONS, REMISSIONS, ETC., IN RAWAL PINDI DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth); Answer, Mr. Morley 742

LAND TAXATION IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Morley 742

INDIAN GRIEVANCES.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 743

THE TRANSVAAL LOAN—OUTSTANDING BALANCE ON AN OLD LOAN.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Churchill 743

IRISH AUDIT WORK.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 743

July 30.] *Page*

Duties of the Assistant Comptroller and Auditor-General.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 744

Dangerous Level Crossing at Colwick, Nottinghamshire.—Question, Mr. Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Kearley 744

The American Tobacco Trust.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Kearley .. 745

Deaths Caused by Eating Tuberculous Foods, etc.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. John Burns 745

Small Holdings Bill—Estimated Cost of Administration.—Question, Mr. E. Gardner (Berkshire, Wokingham); Answer, Sir E. Strachey 745

Foul Brood Amongst Bees.—Question, Mr. Lardner (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. T. W. Russell 746

Erection of Barracks, Military Hospitals, etc., in Transvaal and Orange River Colony.—Question, Mr. Whitbread (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 746

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Renown."—Question, Mr. Gretton (Rutland); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 747

H.M.S. "New Zealand."—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 748

The Channel Fleet.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 749

English Shooting Team for the Colonies.—Questions, Mr. Courthope (Sussex Rye); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington), Mr. Speaker 749

Cartridge Breech Pressures.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 750

Colonies Grants to Shooting Teams.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 750

Copper Pressure Gauges.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 751

Bullet Velocities.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 751

Muzzle Velocity.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 752

Army Contracts for Wales.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 752

Mooltan Barracks, Tidworth.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Haldane 752

County Association Secretaryships.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Haldane 752

July 30.] Page

THE ROYAL SCOTS GREYS.—Questions, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham), Captain Faber; Answers, Mr. Haldane 753

SCOTS GREYS OFFICERS' ACCOMMODATION AT TIDWORTH.—Questions, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool), Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrew's Burghs), Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Haldane 753

OPIUM CULTIVATION IN INDIA.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 755

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION.—Questions, Sir H. Cotton, Mr. Rees; Answers, Mr. Morley 755

THE MYMENSINGH RIOTS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 756

INDIAN AGENTS PROVOCATEURS.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley 757

SEDITIOUS INDIAN NEWSPAPERS.—Questions, Mr. Rees; Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Morley 757

CHILD LABOUR IN INDIAN FACTORIES.—Question, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham); Answer, Mr. Morley 758

CHENAB CANAL LANDS.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley 759

MOTI LAL SINGH.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley 759

LALA RAJPAT RAI.—Questions, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury), Mr. Rees, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answers, Mr. Morley, Mr. Speaker 759

UNSKILLED LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 760

ISTHMIAN CANAL LABOUR CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill 761

BRITISH GARRISON IN CENTRAL AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Churchill 761

BRUNEI PROTECTORATE FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. Churchill 761

TRINIDAD FOREIGN LABOUR CONTRACTS.—Questions, Mr. Starkey (Nottinghamshire, Newark), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answers, Mr. Churchill 762

NEW HEBRIDES CONVENTION.—Questions, Mr. Pike Pease, Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answers, Mr. Churchill.. 763

COLONIAL OFFICIALS' PENSIONS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 763

TRANSVAAL CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 764

July 30.] *Page*

CHINA AND INDIAN OPIUM.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 764

EXPLOSIVES FROM AIRSHIPS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Sir E. Grey 764

ANGLO-RUSSIAN UNDERSTANDING.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Sir E. Grey 765

RUSSIA AND THE ALAND ISLANDS.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool; Answer, Sir E. Grey 765

TREATY WITH SWEDEN AND NORWAY.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Sir E. Grey 766

IRISH CURED MACKEREL IN THE UNITED STATES.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Sir E. Grey 766

OPIUM TRADE.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Sir E. Grey 767

EGYPTIAN ARMY OF OCCUPATION—DECREE OF 1895.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Sir E. Grey 767

KHEDIVIAL SCHOOL OF LAW AT CAIRO.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Sir E. Grey 768

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 769

CONSOLIDATED FUND CHARGES.—Question, Mr. Bowles; Answer, Mr. Asquith 770

DUBLIN AND CHARLES II.—Question, Mr. Bowles; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 770

FRIENDLY SOCIETY OFFICIALS AND THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 771

MOTOR BUS TRAFFIC IN PICCADILLY.—Questions, Captain Faber, Mr. Lupton; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 771

ANTI-RUSSIAN DEMONSTRATION IN TRAFALGAR SQUARE.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 772

MAINTENANCE OF MAIN ROADS.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 773

MORTALITY STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln); Answer, Mr. John Burns 773

CROYDON VACCINATION CASES.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, Mr. John Burns 773

CHANNEL ISLANDS AND JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade, Mr. Kearley, Devonport 774

Page

Railway Tank Engines.—Question, Mr. Wardle (Stockport); Answer, Mr. Kearley 755

The Post Office and Ferry Maintenance.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Captain Norton (Newington, W., for Mr. Sydney Buxton) 775

Magazine Rates to Canada.—Question, Mr. Boulton (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey); Answer, Captain Norton 776

Education Grant.—Questions, Mr. Gretton, Sir Philip Magnus (London University); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 776

New Forest Commoners.—Question, Sir Robert Hobart (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 777

Parliamentary Reports.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Runciman 778

Wrexham Parochial Charities.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 778

"Daily Graphic" Irish Photographs.—Questions, Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.), Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) 779

Deportation of Paupers to Ireland.—Questions, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. lynn; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 780

Roe Estate, Queen's County.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell 781

King's County Rents Case of Mrs. Mary Connor.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Birrell 781

Lagan Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. James O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 782

Ancketill Grove, Demesne County, Monaghan.—Question, Mr. Lardner (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 782

Irish Rating System.—Question, Mr. Lardner; Answer, Mr. Birrell 783

Civil Rights of Irish Teachers.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer Mr. Birrell 783

Irish Board of Works Accountant.—Questions, Mr. Delany, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Speaker 784

The Radio-Telegraphic Convention.—Motion for Adjournment.

Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe) asked leave to move the adjournment of the House to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance

July 30.] *Page*

—namely, the Report of the Select Committee on the Radio-Telegraphic Convention, and the declared intention of His Majesty's Government to proceed to ratification without affording the House an opportunity of discussion on the subject.

And, the pleasure of the House being signified, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter past eight this evening 785

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.

Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 278.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 278.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 294] 785

Selection (Standing Committees).—Sir Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following Fifteen Members (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill) :—Sir Edward Boyle, Mr. Hugh Barrie, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Charles Craig, Sir Samuel Scott, Mr. Nield, Mr. Staveley-Hill, Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Hills, Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. John Ward, Sir Randall Cremer, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. M'Killop, and Mr. Trevelyan.

Report to lie upon the Table 786

House of Commons (Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms).—Report from the Select Committee brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 279] 786

Standing Committees (Chairmen's Panel).—Mr. Stuart-Wortley reported from the Chairmen's Panel; that they had discharged Mr. Eugene Wason from being Chairman of the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills; that they had discharged Sir William Holland from being Chairman of Standing Committee A, and had appointed him to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills in place of Mr. Eugene Wason; that they had discharged Mr. Stuart-Wortley from being Chairman of Standing Committee C, and had appointed Mr. John William Wilson to act as Chairman of the said Committee C, in his place, such discharge and appointment to take effect at the conclusion of the Proceedings on the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill.

Report to lie upon the Table 786

Finance Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Sir Gilbert Parker 786
Mr. Byles (Salford, N.) 798
Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington) 800

Mr. Everett (Suffolk, Woodbridge) 803
Mr. Leverton Harris (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) 806
Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow) 812
Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton) 814
Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) 816
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 819
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 823
Mr. Stuart (Sunderland) 828
Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) 828
Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton) 832

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 349.)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

King's Message [24th July], read.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 831

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,000 be granted to His Majesty, to be issued to the Earl of Cromer, O.M., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., in recognition of his eminent services as Agent and Consul-General in Egypt."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 839

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock and leave having been given to move the Adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 10, Further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

ADJOURNMENT (UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. (O.) RADIOTELEGRAPHIC CONVENTION).

Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe) 841
Mr. Gwynn (Galway) 848

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir Edward Sassoon.*) .. ..

The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 854

Question put, and negatived.

SUPPLY.—Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,000, be granted to His Majesty, to be issued to the Earl of Cromer, O.M., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., in recognition of his eminent services as Agent and Consul-General in Egypt," resumed.

July 30.] Page

Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 858
Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.) 867
Mr. Grayson (Yorkshire, W.R., Colne Valley) 873
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 875
Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside) 883

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 254; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 350.)

Resolution to be reported upon Thursday; Committee to sit again To-morrow (Wednesday).

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Lords' Amendments be now considered."

Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 889
Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) 893
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 893

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords' Amendments considered.

Lords' Amendments—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Regulars,' to insert the words 'and their Reserves.'"

Read a second time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In page 2, line 1, after the word 'or,' to insert the words 'failing him.'"

Read a second time.

Mr. Wyndham 895
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 895

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In line 18, after the word 'appointment' to insert the words 'by the Army Council during the first three years after the passing of this Act and subsequently for the election.'"

Read a second time.

July 30.] Page

Mr. Haldane 896
Sir Charles Dilke 896
Mr. Wyndham 896

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In page 4, line 19, after the word 'assistance,' to insert the words 'out of money voted by Parliament.'"

Read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (*Leicester*) 897
Mr. Haldane 901
Mr. Wyndham 902
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 904
Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 905
Mr. Wedgewood (*Newcastle-under-Lyme*) 908
Sir Samuel Scott (*Marylebone, W.*) 908
Mr. Maddison (*Burnley*) 910
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 912
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 913

Subsequent Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In line 20, after the word 'locally,' to insert the words "such requirements where practicable to be embodied in regulations which shall be issued to County Associations from time to time, and on the first occasion not later than the first day of January one thousand nine hundred and nine.'"

Read a second time.

Sir Charles Dilke 916
Mr. Haldane 917

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In line 31, after the word 'reservists,' to insert the words 'and a Special Reservist may be re-engaged, and when re-engaged shall continue, subject to the terms of service applicable to Special Reservists.'"

Read a second time.

Sir Charles Dilke 918
Mr. Haldane 918

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

> " In line 33 at the beginning of the clause to insert :—' (1) Every Order in Council or scheme required by this Act to be made before each House of Parliament shall be so laid before forty days next after it is made, if Parliament is then sitting, or if not, within forty days after the commencement of the then next ensuing session ; and, if an Address is presented to His Majesty by either House of Parliament within the next subsequent forty days, praying that any such order or scheme may be annulled, His Majesty may thereupon by Order in Council annul the same, and the order or scheme so annulled shall thenceforth become void and of no effect, but without prejudice to the validity of any proceedings which may in the meantime have been taken under the same.' "

Read a second time.

Sir Charles Dilke 918
Mr. Haldane 919

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

SHERIFFS COURTS (SCOTLAND) [REMUNERATION].

Resolution reported, " That it is expedient to authorise the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of the remuneration of any interim sheriff-substitute appointed in pursuance of any Act of the present session to regulate and amend the laws and practice relating to the civil procedure in Sheriff Courts in Scotland."

Resolution agreed to.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [LORDS] —Read a second time. Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for to-morrow (Wednesday). —(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Public Health Bill.—As amended (in the Standing Committee and on re-committal), considered ; read the third time, and passed.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1905–6.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

I. Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the

Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - - - -	455,264	18	4
Total Deficits - - - - - - -	217,505	19	2
Net Surplus - - - - - - -	£237,758	19	2

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

1. Resolved, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."—(*Mr. **Runciman.***)

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1905–6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	*s.*	*d.*	*£*	*s.*	*d.*
1	Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines -	—			163,909	1	8
2	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy -	18,072	14	10	—		
3	Medical Establishments and Services -	12,042	10	4	—		
4	Martial Law - - - - - - -	720	19	6	—		
5	Educational Services - - - - -	10,824	8	0	—		
6	Scientific Services - - - - - -	—			3,782	10	4
7	Royal Naval Reserves - - - - -	35,539	13	0	—		
8	Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c. :						
	I. Personnel - - - - -	63,015	9	2	—		
	II. Matériel - - - - - -	11,824	16	1	—		
	III. Contract Work- - - - -	46,417	6	4	—		
9	Naval Armaments - - - - - -	127,868	17	7	—		
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad - - - - - -	106,664	13	1	—		
11	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	17,471	4	2	—		
12	Admiralty Office - - - - - -	—			5,800	14	1
13	Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay -	—			31,897	17	8
14	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances - -	4,802	6	3	—		
15	Civil Pensions and Gratuities - - -	—			9,550	10	4
—	Amount written off as irrecoverable -	—			2,565	5	1
	Total - - -	455,264	18	4	217,505	19	2
	Net Surplus -	£237,758 19 2					

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - - - -	1,396,005	1	10
Total Deficits - - - - - - - -	61,868	4	0
Net Surplus - - - - -	£1,334,136	17	10

July 30.] Page

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

2. Resolved, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

II. Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ending 31st March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Army Services, 1905–6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1	Pay, &c., of Army - - - - - -	256,166	18	10	—		
2	Medical Establishment: Pay, &c. - -	25,504	11	11	—		
3	Militia: Pay, Bounty, &c. - - - -	66,162	14	8	—		
4	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances	40,604	8	11	—		
5	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances -	—			613	19	1
6	Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts -	187,279	4	7	—		
7	Supplies and Clothing - - - - -	415,222	14	10	—		
8	Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - - - - - -	122,089	1		—		
9	Armaments and Engineer Stores - -	100,865	18	11	—		
10	Works and Buildings - - - - -	155,563	4	9	—		
11	Establishments for Military Education -	7,038	12	2	—		
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	7,910	10	0	—		
13	War Office and Army Accounts Department - - - - - - - -	—			3,936	14	1
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, &c. -	11,597	0	8	—		
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, &c. - -	—			41,452	12	3
16	Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, & Gratuities	—			6,428	3	9
—	Balances irrecoverable - - - -	—			9,436	14	10
	Total - - -	1,396,005	1	10	61,868	4	0
	Net Surplus -	£1,334,136 17 10					

Mr. Victor Cavendish 923
Mr. Asquith 923

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow (Wednesday.)

Whereupon Mr. Deputy-Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of this instant July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, WEDNESDAY, 31st JULY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 925

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 925

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 925

Coventry Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Tees Conservancy Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered, and agreed to 925

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection in regard to the Bradford (Yorks) Order 925

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill—(Bradford (Yorks) Order)—(opposed).—Report from the Committee of Selection, "That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill so far as it relates to Bradford (Yorks) Order; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Order to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Order 925

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Trade Reports (Annual Series).

No. 3878. Brazil; No. 3879. Spain (Canary Islands).

Presented (by Command) and ordered to lie on the Table 926

July 31.] *Page*

Public Trustee Act, 1906.—The Public Trustee Rules, 1907; Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 143) 926

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill [Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of Mayo 926

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

Lord Denman 927
Lord Ashbourne 927

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill [H.L.] [Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 928

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 929

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 931

Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 931

Telegraph (Money) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order) and passed 931

Finance Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Wednesday next; [The Lord Privy Seal (*M. Ripon*)] (No. 144) 932

Public Health Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 145) 932

House adjourned at five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 31st JULY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 932

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 932

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday 932

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 932

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That in case of the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords], Standing Order 211 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) 932

Private Bills (Group K).—Ordered, That the Committee on Group K of Private Bills have leave to sit on Saturday next, notwithstanding any Adjournment of the House.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 933

PETITIONS.

Congo Free State.—Petitions for protection of the Native Races: From Kingston upon Hull; and Nelson; to lie upon the Table 933

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Shettlestone, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 933

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Castle Douglas, in favour; to lie upon the Table 933

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Ross and Cromarty for alteration; to lie upon the Table 933

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.—Petition from Cardiff, against Lords' Amendments to Clause 2 (*f*); to lie upon the Table 933

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Government Institutions (Ireland).—Return [presented 29th July] to be printed. [No. 280] 933

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3878 to 3883 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 933

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 663 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 933

Taxes and Imposts.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th May; *Mr. Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281] 933

July 31.] *Page*

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Public Trustee Rules, 1907 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 282] 934

MANUFACTURED GOODS, EXPORTED AND IMPORTED (UNITED KINGDOM AND GERMANY), 1882–1906.—Return ordered, "showing the value of the Exports, Imports, and excess of Imports of Manufactured Goods (according to the classification adopted in each of the two Countries) in the cases of the United Kingdom and Germany, respectively, in each of the years since 1882, with averages for each quinquennial period; showing also the estimated value of the Exports, Imports, and excess of Imports of Manufactured Goods in the case of Germany, in each of the last five years, based on the classification adopted in the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Bonar Law*) 934

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

HOME OFFICE CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 934

PAYMENT OF WIREMEN IN BIRMINGHAM TELEGRAPH OFFICE.—Question, Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 935

REVENUE FROM LICENCES FOR DEALING IN MANUFACTURED SILVER.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Asquith 935

ANNUITY TO HEIRS OF LORD RODNEY, DUKE OF SCHOMBERG AND EARL NELSON.—Questions, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 936

LIGHTING OF THE NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM.—Question, Mr. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Handsworth); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 938

IRISH JUNIOR ASSISTANT MISTRESSES.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 938

REFUSAL OF INCREMENT TO HEAD TEACHER OF SHROVE NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 938

CHARGE AGAINST CONSTABLE THOMAS M. GOVERN.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 939

APPLICATION FOR REINSTATEMENT OF THOMAS BULLMAN.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 939

PAY OF EXAMINERS IN THE EXCHEQUER AND AUDIT DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 939

TRANSFER OF IRISH AUDIT WORK FROM LONDON TO DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 940

IRISH AUDIT OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 941

BURWELL CROWN FARM.—Question, Mr. Gretton (Rutland); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 941

MILE END GUARDIANS' BREAD CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Hedges (Kent, Tonbridge); Answer, Mr. John Burns 941

Page

MANCHESTER PUBLIC CARTERS AND THE RAILWAY COMPANIES.—Question, Sir Maurice Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 942

CHANNEL ISLANDS SHIPPING LAWS.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 942

HOLME LACY HEREFORD CHARITY.—Question, Mr. T. F. Richards (Wolverhampton, W.); Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 943

CARNARVON ESTATE DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Ellis Davies (Carnarvonshire, Eifion); Answer, Mr. Asquith 944

INDIAN INCOME TAX.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley 944

INDIAN POLICE SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Seymour King; Answer, Mr. Morley 945

TETANUS IN THE PUNJAB.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins; Answer, Mr. Morley 945

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

PORTSMOUTH REVIEW.—Question, Sir Berkeley Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 946

SEA LORDS AND THE PRESS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 946

THE HOME FLEET.—Questions, Sir Berkeley Sheffield, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson 947

DREADNOUGHT ARMAMENTS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 947

WOOLWICH ARSENAL DISCHARGES.—Questions, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 948

DUKE OF YORK'S MILITARY SCHOOL.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 948

INDIAN SALT TAX.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) 949

INDIA AND THE SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Charles Hobhouse 949

PANAMA CANAL LABOUR.—Question, Mr. Staveley Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 950

LABOUR INSPECTION IN THE NEW HEBRIDES.—Question, Mr. Staveley Hill; Answer, Mr. Churchill 950

ORANGE RIVER COLONY REVALUATION.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Churchill 950

Natal War Contribution.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 951

St. Helena Water Tax.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 951

Repatriation of Orange River Colony Burghers.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 951

Mauritius Council.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 952

Abolition of Slavery on the Zanzibar Coast Trip.—Questions, Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury), Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 952

Kaid Sir Harry Maclean.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 953

University College Grants.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins; Answer, Mr. Runciman 953

Beer Hawking in London.—Question, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham); Answer, Mr. Runciman 953

Motor Bus Accidents.—Question, Mr. T. Davies, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.), Mr. Speaker 95

Canadian and Australian Customs.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George (Carnarvon Boroughs) 954

Traders' Appeals to the Railway Commission.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 955

Unemployed Grant.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Runciman 956

Afforestation.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Runciman 956

Sugar Beet Cultivation.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 956

Hyde Postmen's Duties.—Question, Mr. Duncan Schwann (Cheshire, Hyde); Answers, Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 957

Training College Regulations.—Questions, Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 957

Denominational Schools and the Grant.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. McKenna 958

Merionethshire Voluntary School Teachers' Salaries.—Questions, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Yoxall (Nottinghamshire, W.), Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square), Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answers, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker 959

Patent Appeals.—Question, Mr. Liddell (Down, W.); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 961

DOG POISONING IN SUTHERLANDSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 962

CROFTERS AND GROUND GAME.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 962

STORNOWAY AND CARLOWAY ROAD.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 962

SHADER (LEWIS) LANDING-PLACE. —Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 963

DOG POISONING IN ROSS-SHIRE.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 963

BALINAKILL BURIAL GROUND.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 963

RIVER DEEL—ASKEATON WEIR.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.), Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, The Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture for Ireland (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, S.) 963

POLICE PROTECTION AT NEWMARKET.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 964

VICEREGAL COMMISSION ON THE POOR LAW.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 965

MARYBOROUGH ASSAULT CASE—MR. THOMAS L. HODGINS, J.P.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell 966

POLICE AND CATTLE DRIVING.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Queen's County, Ossory), Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Birrell 966

ABBEYLEIX OUTRAGE REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Delany; Answers, Mr. Birrell 967

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 967

PROTESTANT BOYS AT ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AT BELFAST.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 968

CATTLE DRIVING NEAR KILLARNEY.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 969

BENMORE (GALWAY) OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell 969

BORRISOKANE CATTLE DRIVING PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 970

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT—ADVANCES UNDER CLAUSE 19.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 970

SIR PERCY FITZPATRICK.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Churchill 971

IRISH TEACHERS AND THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 971

July 31.] *Page*

Irish Labourers Act Loans.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Runciman 972

Irish Trade Statistics.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 972

Emigration from Ireland.—Question, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Captain Norton 972

Ireland and the Special Reports on Educational Subjects.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. McKenna 973

Conferment of Honours.—Questions, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) .. 973

Second Ballots.—Question, Mr. Markham; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 974

Civil Servants Grievances.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 974

Pensions for Public Services.—Questions, Mr. Lea, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 975

Business of the House.—Question, Sir A. Acland-Hood (Somerset, Wellington); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 976

The Grant to Lord Cromer.—Questions, Mr. Markham, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answers, Mr. Speaker 977

Selection (Standing Committees).—Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill):—Sir Edward Boyle, Mr. Barrie, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Charles Craig, Sir Samuel Scott, Mr. Nield, Mr. Staveley-Hill, Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Hills, Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. John Ward, Sir Randal Cremer, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. McKillop, and Mr. Trevelyan.

Report to lie upon the Table 978

Message from the Lords.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to the capacity of Women to be elected and act as Members of County or Town Councils in Scotland." [Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill [Lords] 978

Business of the House (Supply).

Motion made, and Question put, "That on this day, notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 15, Business other than Business of Supply may be taken before Eleven of the clock."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 39. (Division List No. 352) .. 978

July 31.] *Page*

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.—1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. 981
Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham) 987
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 997
Capt. Hervey (Bury St. Edmunds) 1004
Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis) 1008
Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon) 1016
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 1019
Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) 1025

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,800, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Summerbell.*)

Mr. Edmund Robertson 1027
Mr. Jenkins (Chatham) 1028
Sir John Benn (Devonport) 1030
Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1032
Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead) 1033
Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham) 1034
Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth) 1035
Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 1036
Mr. Lambert 1037
Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1038
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1040

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Murray Macdonald (Falkirk Burghs) 1041
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) 1041
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1041
Sir Randal Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston) 1042

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,548,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Murray Macdonald.*)

Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1044
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1044
Mr. Edmund Robertson 1045
Sir A. Acland Hood (Somersetshire, Wellington) 1045
Mr. Jenkins 1046

July 31.]

Page
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) 1046
Mr. Owen Philipps (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) 1046
Mr. Rees 1047
Mr. Sherwell (Huddersfield) 1048

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 86 ; Noes, 263. (Division List No. 353.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, to put forth with the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote under consideration.

Question, " That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,900 be granted for the said Service," put, and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded to put severally the Questions, " That the total amounts of the Votes outstanding in each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, including Supplementary Estimates, and the total amount of the Votes outstanding in the Estimates for the Navy, the Army (including Ordnance Factories) and the Revenue Departments, be granted for the Services defined in those Classes and Estimates :—

CLASS I.

2. " That a sum, not exceeding £312,432, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

		£
4.	Houses of Parliament Buildings (Supplementary)	5,700
10.	Surveys of the United Kingdom - - -	118,905
11.	Harbours under the Board of Trade - - -	16,740
12.	Peterhead Harbour - - - - - -	21,988
14.	Public Works and Buildings, Ireland - -	122,829
15.	Railways, Ireland - - - - - -	26,270
		312,432 "

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 300 ; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 354.)

CLASS II.

3. " That a sum, not exceeding £1,182,699, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

		£ 4
1.	House of Lords Offices - - - - -	17,543
2.	House of Commons Offices - - - -	22,800
3.	Treasury and Subordinate Offices - - -	60,919

July 31.]

	£
4. Home Office	128,735
5. Foreign Office	40,698
6. Colonial Office (including a Supplementary sum of £2,200)	37,900
7. Privy Council Office	6,120
9. Mercantile Marine Services	72,816
10. Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade	1,508
12. Charity Commission	15,892
13. Civil Service Commission	23,750
15. Friendly Societies Registry	5,624
16. Local Government Board	147,782
17. Lunacy Commission, England	10,905
20. Public Record Office	14,190
21. Public Works Loan Commission	1,500
22. Registrar-General's Office, England	25,994
23. Stationery and Printing	418,053
24. Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, etc., Office	13,398
25. Works and Public Buildings Office	52,596
26. Secret Service	10,000
Scotland.	
29. Lunacy Commission	3,799
30. Registrar-General's Office	2,978
Ireland.	
32. Household of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland	2,632
33. Chief Secretary for Ireland	17,756
35. Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,051
37. Public Record Office	3,580
39. Registrar-General's Office	7,332
40. Valuation and Boundary Survey	14,848
	£1,182,699 "

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 306 ; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 355.)

CLASS III.

4. " That a sum, not exceeding £1,569,601, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz :—

	£
1. Law Charges	42,774
2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	21,994
3. Supreme Court of Judicature	177,556
4. Land Registry	22,813
5. County Courts	3
6. Police, England and Wales	25,036

Scotland.

10. Law Charges and Courts of Law	50,706
11. Register House, Edinburgh	27,700
12. Crofters' Commission	2,545
13. Prisons	53,650

Ireland.

14. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	37,872
15. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments	59,086
16. Irish Land Commission	139,050
17. County Court Officers, etc.	66,298
19. Royal Irish Constabulary	721,499
20. Prisons	62,556
21. Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,251
22. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,262
	£1,569,601 "

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 304 ; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 356.)

CLASS IV.

5. " That a sum, not exceeding £8,928,337, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Board of Education (including a Supplementary Sum of £200,000)	6,793,646
2. British Museum	111,041
3. National Gallery	7,233
4. National Portrait Gallery	2,897
5. Wallace Collection	3,454
6. Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	30,749
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	141,400
8. Public Education, Scotland (including a Supplementary Sum of £11,000)	1,183,554
9. National Galleries, Scotland	2,416

Ireland.

10. Public Education	648,360
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners	510
12. National Gallery	1,147
13. Queen's Colleges	2,200
	£8,928,337 "

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 308 ; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 357.)

CLASS V.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,407,405, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services viz. :—

	£
1. Diplomatic and Consular Services - - -	319,340
2. Colonial Services (including a Supplementary Sum of £132,690) - - - - -	910,289
2A. Colonial Services (Jamaica Earthquake Relief, Grant in Aid) - - - - - -	150,000
3. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable - -	26,776
4. Cyprus (Grant in Aid) - - - - - -	1,000
	£1,407,405 "

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 306 ; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 358.)

CLASS VI.

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £146,079, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
3. Hospitals and Charities, Ireland - - -	139
4. Savings Banks' and Friendly Societies' Deficiencies - - - - - - - -	145,940
	£146,079 "

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 308 ; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 359.)

CLASS VII.

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £386,191, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Temporary Commissions	36,000
2. Miscellaneous Expenses	46,151
3. Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	4,601
4. Ireland Development Grant	85,000
5. Expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905	200,000
6. Repayments to Civil Contingencies Fund	14,439
	£386,191 ”

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 307 ; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 360.)

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

9. “ That a sum, not exceeding £16,036,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Navy Services, viz. :—

	£
3. Medical Establishments and Services	268,700
4. Martial Law	14,200
5. Educational Services	172,500
6. Scientific Services	65,100
7. Royal Naval Reserves	418,300
8. Section 2. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Matériel	3,035,200
8. Section 3. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Contract Work	7,646,000
9. Naval Armaments	2,348,700
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services	401,000
12. Admiralty Office	364,600
14. Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances	1,302,000
	£16,036,300 ”

Question put, and agreed to.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

10. “ That a sum, not exceeding £9,758,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure on the Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz. :—

	£
2. Medical Establishment, Pay, etc.	460,000
3. Militia, Pay, Bounty, etc.	840,000
4. Imperial Yeomanry, Pay and Allowances	410,000
5. Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances	1,152,000
6. Quartering, Transport, and Remounts	1,909,000

	£
8. Ordnance Department, Establishments and General Stores - - - - - -	620,000
11. Establishments for Military Education - -	137,000
12. Miscellaneous Effective Services - - -	67,000
13. War Office and Army Accounts Department -	567,000
14. Half Pay, Retired Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers - - - - -	1,714,000
15. Pensions and other Non-Effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others - - -	1,709,000
16. Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities - -	173,000
Ordnance Factories - - - - - -	100
	£9,758,100 ”

Question put, and agreed to.

Revenue Departments Estimates, 1907–8.

11. “ That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to his Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs.”

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 304 ; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 361.)

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow.

Ways and Means.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question put, “ That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ended on the 31st day of March, 1908, the sum of £72,563,714 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.”

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 276 ; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 362.)

Motion made, and Question put, “ That the Chairman do report this Resolu-to the House.”

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 245 ; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 363.)

Resolution to be reported this day.

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill.—Order for the Second Reading.

The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1097

July 31.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 1100
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.) 1104
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 1105
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 1111
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 1114
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 1116
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 1119
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1121
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1122
Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) 1124
Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 1125

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed to a Standing Committee.

Evidence (Colonial Statues) Bill.—Not amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 1, lines 5 and 6, to leave out the words 'other instruments having statutory force passed, issued, or made,' and to insert the words 'statutes passed.'"

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words 'or under the authority of.'"

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'possession,' to insert the words 'and of orders, regulations, and other instruments issued or made, whether before or after the passing of this Act, under the authority of any such Act, ordinance, or statute.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1126

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'desertion' to insert the words 'and an authentic copy of which shall have been transferred by the Governor to one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State.'"—(*Mr. Bowles*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1127

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

July 31.] *Page*

Amendments proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 1, line 8, after the word 'possession' to insert the words 'and of orders, regulations, and other instruments issued or made, whether before or after the passing of this Act, under the authority of any such Act, ordinance, or statute.'"
>
> "In line 12, after the word 'copy,' to insert the words 'or pretended copy.'"
>
> "In line 12, after the word 'ordinance,' to insert the words 'statute, order, regulation.'"
>
> "In lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'copy of any such Act, ordinance, or instrument,' and insert the words 'such copy or pretended copy."
>
> "In line 17, to leave out the words 'be guilty of felony and.'"
>
> "In line 18, to leave out the words 'penal servitude for a period not exceeding five years' and insert the words 'imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding twelve months.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. Bowles 1127

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 1, lines 21 and 22, to leave out the words 'purporting to be the printer.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Churchill 1128

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

Australian States Constitution Bill [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1 :—

Mr. Ashley 1129
Mr. Churchill 1130
Mr. Forster (*Kent, Sevenoaks*) 1131

Clause agreed to.

Clause 26 :—

Mr. Forster 1131
Mr. Churchill 1131

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported without Amendment.

Read a third time, and passed.

July 31.] *Page*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1905–6.

Resolutions reported—

I. Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz:—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - - - -	455,264	18	4
Total Deficits - - - - - - -	217,505	19	2
Net Surplus - - - - -	£237,758	19	2

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

1. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1905–6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure. Surpluses. £ s. d.			Deficits. £ s. d.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1	Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines -	—			163,909	1	8
2	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy -	18,072	14	10	—		
3	Medical Establishments and Services -	12,042	10	4	—		
4	Martial Law - - - - - - -	720	19	6	—		
5	Educational Services - - - - -	10,824	8	0	—		
6	Scientific Services - - - - - -	—			3,782	10	4
7	Royal Naval Reserves - - - - -	35,539	13	0	—		
8	Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c.:						
	I. Personnel - - - - -	63,015	9	2	—		
	II. Matériel - - - - - -	11,824	16	1	—		
	III. Contract Work- - - -	46,417	6	4	—		
9	Naval Armaments - - - - - -	127,868	17	7	—		
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad - - - - - -	106,664	13	1	—		
11	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	17,471	4	2	—		
12	Admiralty Office - - - - - -	—			5,800	14	1
13	Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay -	—			31,897	17	8
14	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances - -	4,802	6	3	—		
15	Civil Pensions and Gratuities - - -	—			9,550	10	4
—	Amount written off as irrecoverable -	—			2,565	5	1
	Total - - -	455,264	18	4	217,505	19	2
	Net Surplus -	£237,758	19	2			

July 31.] *Page*
Mr. Victor Cavendish (*Derbyshire, W.*) 1133

II. Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ending 31st March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those services but that as shown in the Schedule hereto appended the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - - - - -	1,396,005	1	10
Total Deficits - - - - - - - -	61,868	4	0
Net Surplus - - - - -	£1,334,136	17	10

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

2. " That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Army Services, 1905–6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
1	Pay, &c., of Army - - - - -	256,166	18	10	—		
2	Medical Establishment: Pay, &c. - -	25,504	11	11	—		
3	Militia: Pay, Bounty, &c. - - - -	66,162	14	8	—		
4	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances	40,604	8	11	—		
5	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances -	—			613	19	1
6	Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts -	187,279	4	7	—		
7	Supplies and Clothing - - - - -	415,222	14	10	—		
8	Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - - - - - -	122,089	1	7	—		
9	Armaments and Engineer Stores - -	100,865	18	11	—		
10	Works and Buildings - - - - -	155,563	4	9	—		
11	Establishments for Military Education -	7,038	12	2	—		
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	7,910	10	0	—		
13	War Office and Army Accounts Department - - - - - - - -	—			3,936	14	1
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, &c. -	11,597	0	8	—		
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, &c. - -	—			41,452	12	3
16	Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, & Gratuities	—			6,428	3	9
—	Balances irrecoverable - - - - -	—			9,436	14	10
	Total - - -	1,396,005	1	10	61,868	4	0
	Net Surplus -	£1,334,136	17	10			

August 1.] *Page*

Resolutions agreed to.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at six minutes before Three o'clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 1st AUGUST, 1907.

The Right Honourable Sir James Kitson, Baronet, having been created Baron Airedale of Gledhow, in the West Riding of the county of York, was in the usual manner introduced.

Sir Montagu Samuel Montagu, Baronet, having been created Baron Swaythling of Swaythling, in the county of Southampton, was in the usual manner introduced.

Sir James Blyth, Baronet, having been created Baron Blyth of Blythwood, in the county of Essex, was in the usual manner introduced 1137

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County (Council) Money Bill; Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons .. 1137

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—Commons' Amendments to be considered on Monday next 1137

Australian States Constitution Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1137

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4.) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1137

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1137

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4.) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered (on Motion), and agreed to 1137

London County Council General Powers Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill—(Bradford (Yorks) Order).—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Craven be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Duke of Sutherland; read and agreed to 1138

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Commons' Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to 1138

Armagh Urban District Council Bill.—Order of the Day read for resuming the adjourned debate on Amendment moved after Third Reading.

Lord Denman 1138
The Chairman of Committees (*The Earl of Onslow*) 1144

Moved, "That the Bill be referred to the Examiners to report whether the Standing Orders have been complied with in respect of the Amendments made in Committee of this House."—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3a."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

Lord Saltoun 1145

Amendment moved, "To leave out the word 'now' in order to add at the end the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Lord Saltoun.*)

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 1147
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1149
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Elgin*) 1151
Lord Avebury 1152
The Earl of Onslow 1153
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 1154
The Earl of Plymouth 1155
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1155

Moved, "That the debate be adjourned."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Viscount Hill 1156

On Question, debate adjourned to Wednesday next.

Butter and Margarine Bill.—Petition to be heard by counsel against; of Manchester Wholesale Provision Association; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1156

Butter and Margarine Bill.—Petition for alteration of; of the mayor, aldermen, and councillors of the metropolitan borough of Wandsworth; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1156

IRELAND (EVICTED TENANTS).—Return respecting. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order of 24th July last), and to be printed. (No. 146) 1156

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3880. Corea.
No. 3881. China (Ichang).
No. 3882. China (Amoy).
No. 3883. Tunis
No. 3884. Colombia (Barranquilla and Cartagena).

August 1.] Page

No. 3885. Persia (Arabistan).
No. 3886. France (Cochin-China).
No. 3887. Netherlands (Dutch Guiana). .. 1156

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 663. State encouragement to Industry in Hungary 1156

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.—Annual Report of the President for the Session 1906–1907 1156

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Thirty-fifth Annual Report, for the year 1905-1906.

1. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer.

2. Supplement in continuation of the report of the medical officer on sanatoria for consumption and certain other aspects of the tuberculosis question 1157

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903 (EVICTED TENANTS).—Memorandum, dated 10th May, 1906, issued by the Estates Commissioners for guidance of assistant inspectors when making inquiries with reference to applications received from persons seeking reinstatement as evicted tenants, or as the representatives of evicted tenants.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1157

Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill.—Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next: [The Lord Elgin (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*)]. (No. 147) 1157

Vaccination (Scotland) Bill [H.L.] [SECONDREADING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 1157

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1161

Amendment moved—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and to add at the end of the Motion the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

Lord Tweedmouth 1169
The Earl of Camperdown 1170
The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 1171
Viscount St. Aldwyn 1173

On Question, whether "now" shall stand part of the Motion, resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Wednesday next.

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill

Moved, "That the House resolve itself into Committee."—(*Lord Weardale.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1175
Lord Weardale 1177

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee;

Bill reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; Bill to be read 3^{a} on Monday next.

Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle Schoolroom, etc.) Charity Bill; Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bills reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^{a} on Monday next .. 1177

Butter and Margarine Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 1177

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

The Earl of Onslow 1179
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1180

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Vaccination Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Allendale 1181

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Wednesday next.

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3 on Monday next 1185

Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill [H.L.]

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3 on Tuesday next 1183

Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill (H.L.).—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1183

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eight o'clock till To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 1st AUGUST, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1184

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [Lords]; Selsey Water Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1184

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 1184

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1184

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to:—Telegraph (Money) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; North British Railway Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords], without Amendment 1184

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Galston for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1184

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Dumbartonshire, against; to lie upon the Table 1184

Weekly Rest-Day Bill.—Petition from Bermondsey and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1185

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Local Government Board.—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1905–6, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

Local Government Board.—Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1905–6, in continuation of the Report of the Medical Officer. On Sanatoria for Consumption and certain other aspects of the Tuberculosis Question (by Command); to lie upon the Table 1185

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3884 to 3887 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.—Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1906–7, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1185

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Memorandum, dated 10th May, 1906, issued by the Estates Commissioners for guidance of Assistant Inspectors when making inquiries with reference to applications received from persons seeking reinstatement as Evicted Tenants or as the representatives of Evicted Tenants [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1185

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Devon), further Return relative thereto [ordered 26th July, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed [No. 283] 1185

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS FROM UNITED KINGDOM TO FRANCE, UNITED STATES, BELGIUM, AND GERMANY.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1186

THE EDALJI CASE.—Question, Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1189

FRENCH NAVAL STATIONS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—Question, Sir Berkeley Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1191

PURCHASE OF LORD CLANMORRIS'S ESTATE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1191

SIR HENRY PRIMROSE AS DIRECTOR OF THE PACIFIC CABLE COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1192

SUGGESTED GRANTS TO ST. HELENA FLAX PLANTERS.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1192

TREASURY ALLOWANCE TO LUNCHEON ROOM OF AUDIT BRANCH.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1193

PAY LEAVE AND ALLOWANCES OF EXAMINERS OF AUDIT DEPARTMENT AND ROYAL ORDNANCE FACTORIES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1193

PROHIBITION OF OFFICIALS OF AUDIT DEPARTMENT TO LUNCH OUTSIDE BUILDING.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1194

COLONIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO AUDIT BRANCH.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1194

POSTAL FACILITIES AT BAR OF SLATTENAGH, COUNTY LEITRIM.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1194

TRUST FUNDS OF GREAT CROSBY HALSALL GIRLS' SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1195

PROSECUTION OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE BANKING COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner; Answer, Mr. Kearley 1195

August 1.] *Page*

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY AND DISSECTION OF RATES FOR GOODS.—Question, Sir J. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answer, Mr. Kearley 1195

COMPLAINTS AGAINST LOCAL COUNCILS UNDER THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1196

ANNUAL COST OF METROPOLITAN ASYLUM, CARSHATLON.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1197

ASSISTANCE OF BLIND PERSONS IN THE COUNTY OF LONDON.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, Mr. Secretary Gladstone 1198

DETENTION OF CHILDREN AWAITING TRIAL.—Question, Mr. A. Allen; Answer, Mr. Secretary Gladstone 1198

CONTROL OF MOTOR CARS—TRAFFIC.—Questions, Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam), Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone .. 1198

ESTATE SCHOOLS IN EASTERN BENGAL.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Morley 1199

REPAYMENTS TOWARDS CAPITAL BY MR. R. PEARSON OF CLONMORE.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1200

OWNER OF WARRENFORD ESTATE, GARRONMACONNELLY.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1200

VETERINARY INTERESTS ON THE BELFAST HEALTH COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1200

INSPECTION OF FOOD AND MEAT.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1200

DELAY IN PURCHASE OF THE BALLYDOYLE ESTATES, COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1202

GOOD SERVICE AWARDS TO IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1202

UNIFORM ESTABLISHMENT FOR SHORT SERVICE BATTALIONS.—Question, Mr. Arnold Forster (Croydon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1203

THE IMPERIAL SERVICE MEDAL.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1203

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MOBILISATION OF THE HOME FLEET.—Question, Mr. Gretton (Rutland); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1204

ROYAL MARINES AND THE MOBILISATION.—Question, Mr. Gretton; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1204

RESERVE OF BATTLESHIP GUNS.—Question, Mr. Gretton; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1205

August 1.]

Page

QUEENSTOWN DEPUTATION.—Question, Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1205

LOCH LONG TORPEDO RANGE.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1205

FRENCH WAR CRAFT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—Question, Sir Berkeley Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1206

ELTHAM COMMON.—Questions, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane (Haddington) 1207

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Questions, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answers, Mr. Haldane 1207

FLAX TRANSPORT IN ST. HELENA.—Question, Mr. Hicks-Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1207

ST. HELENA FLAX INDUSTRY—MR. FULTON'S REPORT.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1208

RAILWAY RATES IN SOUTHERN NIGERIA.—Questions, Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln), Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 1208

LAGOS DUTIES ON SPIRITS.—Question, Mr. Charles Roberts; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1209

SECOND BALLOTS AT ELECTIONS.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1210

EGYPTIAN STUDENTS IN EUROPE.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumber land, Tyneside); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1210

UNSTABLE BUILDINGS IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1210

CAIRO WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1210

NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1211

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE AND THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS.—Questions. Captain Faber, Lord Balcarres, Mr. Lea, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answers, Sir Edward Grey 1211

THE SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1212

BEN NEVIS OBSERVATORIES.—Questions, Sir J. Dewar (Inverness), Mr. Lea Major Anstruther-Gray; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1213

August 1.]

Page

LAND LEGISLATION—THE GOVERNMENT AND EXISTING CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1213

CASE OF FLORENCE DOUGHTY.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1214

THE TRAINING SHIP "EXMOUTH."—Question, Dr. Cooper; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1214

UNEMPLOYMENT—LOCAL COMMITTEES AND THE CENTRAL BODY.—Question, Mr. Carr-Gomm (Southwark, Rotherhithe); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1215

THE UNEMPLOYED AND LABOUR DISPUTES.—Question, Mr. Carr-Gomm; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1215

LONDON DOCKS BILL.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1216

CAPE COLONY TRADE STATISTICS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Kearley 1216

GRANTOWN-ON-SPEY TELEPHONES.—Questions, Mr. A. Williamson (Elgin and Nairn), Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burgh); Answers, Captain Norton 1217

MASTERS OF ENDOWED SCHOOLS—"WRIGHT *v.* ZETLAND AND OTHERS."—Question, Mr. Mallet (Plymouth); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 1218

PARKGATE AND NESTON SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. Lough 1218

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 1219

ORDNANCE SURVEY—CASE OF MR. JOHN GARDNER.—Question, Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 1219

WALPOLE HOUSE FARM, NORFOLK.—Question, Mr. Gretton; Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease 1220

DONEGAL EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF JOHN MONAGHAN.—Question, Mr. C. MacVeigh (Donegal, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1221

THE O'DONOGHUE ESTATE, KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1221

MONOGH BERNARD ESTATE, KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1221

BALLYBUCHEN ESTATE, LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1222

DUNRAVEN ESTATE, LIMERICK.—Question Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1222

MR. COMMISSIONER BAILEY.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1223

WATERFORD LUNATIC ASYLUM.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1223

POOR LAW INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1224

ROSTREVOR RENT DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. T. MacVeagh; Answer Mr. Birrell .. 1225

BALLYDOYLE EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1225

THE DISTURBANCES IN BELFAST.—Questions, Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow) and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 1227

IRISH GUARANTEED LAND STOCK.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1228

IMAAL CAMP ROADS.—Question, Mr. William Abraham; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1229

SMALL LANDOWNERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Questions, Sir John Dewar, Mr. Gulland (Dumfries, Burghs), Mr. Sutherland (Elgin Burghs), and Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1230

PARLIAMENTARY OFFICIALS AND THE LONG SITTINGS.—Questions, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) and Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1230

DISCHARGES AT WOOLWICH.—Question, Mr. Crooks; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1231

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. Akers-Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine's); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1232

STANDING COMMITTEE C.—Ordered, That Standing Committee C have leave to sit this day during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. Harcourt*) 1233

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Nicholas Joseph Murphy, esquire, for the County of Kilkenny (South Kilkenny Division) 1233

Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 297] 1233

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 298] 1233

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General, Dr. Macnamara, Sir Thomas Whittaker, Mr. Soares, Mr. Hooper, and Mr. Vaughan Davies; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. McKenna, Mr. Lough, Mr. Mallet, Mr. Acland Allen, Mr. Holt, and Mr. Charles H. Corbett.

August 1.] Page

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee: That they had added to Standing Committee B the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Sir William Anson, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Viscount Morpeth, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Haviland Burke, Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. W. E. Harvey, Mr. Walter Rea, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, Mr. Helme, Mr. King, Mr. Bramsdon, Mr. Agnew, and Mr. Bateman Hope.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee: That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards and Mr. Hugh Law; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Curran and Mr. John O'Connor.

Reports to lie upon the Table 1233

British North America Bill.—Lords' Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 299] 1234

NEW BILLS.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—"To amend the Coal Mines Regulation Acts, 1887 to 1905, for the purpose of limiting hours of work below ground," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; supported by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 295] 1234

Cabs and Stage Carriages (London) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to Cabs and Stage Carriages in London," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; supported by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 296] 1234

SUPPLY [20TH ALLOTTED DAY] [31ST JULY].

Resolutions reported—

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS I.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £312,432, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
4. Houses of Parliament Buildings (Supplementary)	5,700
10. Surveys of the United Kingdom	118,905
11. Harbours under the Board of Trade	16,740
12. Peterhead Harbour	21,988
14. Public Works and Buildings, Ireland	122,829
15. Railways, Ireland	26,270
	312,432."

Class II.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,182,699, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Service, viz. :—

	£
1. House of Lords Offices	17,543
2. House of Commons Offices	22,800
3. Treasury and Subordinate Offices	60,919
4. Home Office	128,735
5. Foreign Office	40,698
6. Colonial Office (including a Supplementary Sum of £2,200)	37,900
7. Privy Council Office	6,120
9. Mercantile Marine Services	72,816
10. Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade	1,508
12. Charity Commission	15,892
13. Civil Service Commission	23,750
15. Friendly Societies Registry	5,624
16. Local Government Board	147,782
17. Lunacy Commission, England	10,905
20. Public Record Office	14,190
21. Public Works Loan Commission	1,500
22. Registrar-General's Office, England	25,994
23. Stationery and Printing	418,053
24. Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, etc., Office	13,398
25. Works and Public Buildings Office	52,596
26. Secret Service	10,000
Scotland.	
29. Lunacy Commission	3,799
30. Registrar-General's Office	2,978
Ireland.	
32. Household of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland	2,632
33. Chief Secretary for Ireland	17,756
35. Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,051
37. Public Record Office	3,580
39. Registrar-General's Office	7,332
40. Valuation and Boundary Survey	14,848
	£1,182,699 "

CLASS III.

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,569,601, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Law Charges	42,774
2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses	21,944
3. Supreme Court of Judicature	177,556
4. Land Registry	22,813
5. County Courts	3
6. Police, England and Wales	25,036
Scotland.	
10. Law Charges and Courts of Law	50,706
11. Register House, Edinburgh	27,700
12. Crofters' Commission	2,545
13. Prisons	53,650
Ireland.	
14. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	37,872
15. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments	59,086
16. Irish Land Commission	139,050
17. County Court Officers, etc.	66,298
19. Royal Irish Constabulary	721,499
20. Prisons	62,556
21. Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,251
22. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,262
	£1,569,601"

CLASS IV.

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,928,337, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Board of Education (including a Supplementary Sum of £200,000)	6,793,646
2. British Museum	111,041
3. National Gallery	7,233
4. National Portrait Gallery	2,897
5. Wallace Collection	3,454
6. Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	30,479
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	141,400
8. Public Education, Scotland (including a Supplementary Sum of £11,000)	1,183,554
9. National Galleries, Scotland	2,416

Ireland.

10. Public Education - - - - - -	648,360
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners - - -	510
12. National Gallery - - - - - -	1,147
13. Queen's Colleges - - - - - -	2,200
	£8,928,337 ”

Class V.

6. “That a sum, not exceeding £1,407,405, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

1. Diplomatic and Consular Services - - -	319,340
2. Colonial Services (including a Supplementary) Sum of £132,690) - - - - -	910,289
2a. Colonial Services (Jamaica Earthquake Relief, Grant in Aid) - - - - - -	150,000
3. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable - -	26,776
4. Cyprus (Grant in Aid) - - - - -	1,000
	£1,407,405 ”

Class VI.

7. “That a sum, not exceeding £146,079, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
3. Hospitals and Charities, Ireland - - - -	139
4. Savings Banks' and Friendly Societies' Deficiencies - - - - - -	145,940
	£146,079 ”

Class VII.

8. “That a sum, not exceeding £386,191, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Temporary Commissions - - - - -	36,000
2. Miscellaneous Expenses - - - - - -	46,151
3. Repayments to the Local Loans Fund - -	4,601
4. Ireland Development Grant - - - -	85,000
5. Expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 - - - - - - - - - -	200,000
6. Repayments to Civil Contingencies Fund -	14,439
	£386,191 ”

August 1.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £16,036,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Navy Services, viz. :—

	£
3. Medical Establishments and Services	268,700
4. Martial Law	14,200
5. Educational Services	172,500
6. Scientific Services	65,100
7. Royal Naval Reserves	418,300
8. Section 2. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Matériel	3,035,200
8. Section 3. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Contract Work	7,646,000
9. Naval Armaments	2,348,700
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services	401,000
12. Admiralty Office	364,600
14. Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances	1,302,000
	£16,036,300"

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,758,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure on th rmy Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz. :—

	£
2. Medical Establishment, Pay, etc.	460,000
3. Militia, Pay, Bounty, etc.	840,000
4. Imperial Yeomanry, Pay and Allowances	410,000
5. Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances	1,152,000
6. Quartering, Transport, and Remounts	1,909,000
8. Ordnance Department, Establishments and General Stores	620,000
11. Establishments for Military Education	137,000
12. Miscellaneous Effective Services	67,000
13. War Office and Army Accounts Department	567,000
14. Half Pay, Retired Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers	1,714,000
15. Pensions and other Non-Effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others	1,709,000
16. Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities	173,000
Ordnance Factories	100
	£9,758,100

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in

course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

First Two Resolutions read a second time, and postponed.

Third Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich) 1240
Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford) 1245
Mr. King (Cheshire, Knutsford) 1249
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 1253
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1258
Mr. McKean (Monaghan, S.) 1266
Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.) 1280
Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) 1287
Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall) 1295
Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough) 1296
Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury) 1298
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1301
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1305

Question put, and agreed to.

And, it being Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to Standing Order No. 15, to put forthwith the Questions, That this House doth agree with the Committee in all the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, the Navy Estimates, the Army Estimates, the Revenue Departments Estimates and another outstanding Resolution

CIVIL SERVICES ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS I.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class I. of the Civil Services Estimates," put, and agreed to.

CLASS II

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class II. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 281 ; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 364.)

CLASS III.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class III. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 277 ; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 365.)

CLASS IV.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class IV. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 278 ; Noes, 65. (Division List, No. 366.)

CLASS V.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class V. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 278 ; Noes, 69. (Division List, No. 367.)

CLASS VI

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VI. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 280 ; Noes, 68. (Division List, No. 368.)

CLASS VII.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VII. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 281 ; Noes, 68. (Division List, No. 369.)

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907–8

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Navy Estimates," put, and agreed to.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Army Estimates," put, and agreed to.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Revenue Departments Estimates," put, and agreed to.

EARL OF CROMER.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolution reported in respect of the Grant to the Earl of Cromer."

The House divided :—Ayes, 227 ; Noes, 88. (Division List, No. 370) .. 1342

August 1.] *Page*

WAYS AND MEANS [31ST JULY].

Resolution reported, "That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, the sum of £72,563,714 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Runciman.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill.

"To apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and eight, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next 1345

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deductions for Propelling Power) (Re-Committed) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

Mr. Brace (Glamorganshire, S.) 1345

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 8, to leave out the words 'fifty-five,' and insert the words 'thirty-five.'"—(*Mr. Brace.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Cory (Cornwall, St. Ives) 1349
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1354
Sir D. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District) 1357
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) 1359
Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby) 1362
Mr. Howell Davies (Bristol, S.) 1363
Mr. Joyce (Limerick) 1364
Mr. Llewelyn Williams (Carmarthen District) 1365
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1367

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out the word 'registered' and insert the word 'register.'"

"In page 1, line 17, to leave out the word 'registered' and insert the word 'register.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'July' and insert the word 'January.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. Joyce 1369

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'ten,' and insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. Morton 1369
Mr. Lloyd-George 1370
Mr. Jenkins (*Chatham*) 1371
Mr. Hills (*Durham*) 1371
Mr. Morton 1372

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered this day.

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill [Lords].—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1372

Adjournment.—Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to 1372

Adjourned at ten minutes after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 2nd AUGUST, 1907.

Commission.—The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Imported Watch-cases.
2. Territorial and Reserve Forces.
3. Telegraph (Money).
4. Australian States Constitution.
5. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1).
6. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3).
7. Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation.
8. Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation.
9. Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1.)
10. Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2).

August 2.] *Page*

11. Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 3).
12. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3).
13. Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4).
14. Tramways Order Confirmation.
15. Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks.
16. Sheffield Corporation.
17. Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation).
18. Tynemouth Corporation (Water).
19. Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways.
20. Humber Conservancy.
21. North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply.
22. Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply.
23. Sunderland Corporation.
24. Coventry Corporation.
25. Manchester Corporation Tramways.
26. North British Railway.
27. Tees Conservancy.
28. Annfield Plain and District Gas.
29. Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation.
30. South Wales Mineral Railway.
31. Pasley Children Legitimisation 1373

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water Bill [H.L.] —Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1374

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1374

British North America Bill—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1374

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next: (The Lord President [*E. Crewe*]). (No. 148) 1374

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 149) 1374

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 2ND AUGUST, 1907.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—John Muldoon, esquire, for the county of Wicklow (East Wicklow Division) 1374

August 2.] *Page*

COMMISSION.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills. (See page 1373) 1374

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill: Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 1375

Aberdeen Corporation Electricity Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1375

Midland Railway Bill [LORDS] (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1375

Portishead District Water Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1375

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1375

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1375

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.—Petition from Stroud and Mid-Gloucester, for protection of the Native Races, to lie upon the Table 1375

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1375

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from Reading, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 1375

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Kirkcudbright, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1375

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.—Petition from Tooting Junction and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1375

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).—Copy presented of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1375

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 9) Warrant, dated 19th July, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1376

August 2.] *Page*

TUBERCULOSIS (HUMAN AND BOVINE) (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Appendix, Part II. (two volumes), to the Second Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of Human and Animal Tuberculosis [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1376

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF STAFFORD).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Stafford altering the Handsworth Sandwell (South) Polling District of the Handsworth Parliamentary Division of Staffordshire [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1376

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Memorandum on the Teaching of Drawing [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1376

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report No. 532 (Surveys of British Africa, Annual Report of the Colonial Survey Committee, Second Year, to July, 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1376

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—SUPREME COURT (RULES).—Copy of Rules of the Supreme Court, dated 3rd August, 1907 [by Act] 1376

VALUATION OF LANDS (SCOTLAND) ACT.—Copy ordered, "of the Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Act, 1854, and of amending Acts."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 284] 1376

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT, 1906-7.—Return ordered, "showing, in respect of the financial year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, the distribution of the moneys paid into the Local Taxation Account in pursuance of the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1888, the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, the Finance Act, 1894, and other Acts (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 351, of Session 1906)."—(*Dr. Macnamara*) 1376

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PLASTERING CONTRACTS AT NEW POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, CARTER LANE.—Question, Mr. Horniman (Chelsea); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1377

CONVEYANCE OF MAILS TO THE EAST.—Questions, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answers, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1377

HOLIDAYS OF TRINIDAD LABOURERS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1379

SENTENCES OF DEATH.—Question, Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1380

FEMALE FRENCH POLISHERS IN DOCKYARDS.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1381

SCOTTISH LAND VALUATION LAWS.—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1381

SCHEME FOR DIVISION OF CASTLECALDWELL LANDS, COUNTY FERMANAGH.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1381

August 2.] Page

JUNIOR ASSISTANT MISTRESSES IN SCHOOLS WITH ATTENDANCE BELOW FIFTY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1382

UNTENANTED LAND AT DRUMRANEY.—Question, Sir Walter Nugent (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1382

FEMALE FRENCH POLISHERS AT ORDNANCE FACTORIES.—Question, Mr. O'Grady; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1383

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House do, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next.—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis*) 1383

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 285.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 285.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next. and to be printed. [Bill 300] 1383

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection that they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Sir Randal Cremer; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Nicholls.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. Hugh Law, and Sir Randal Cremer; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Curran, Mr. John O'Connor, and Mr. Nicholls.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Mond; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. George White.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (added in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Agnew; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Alexander Harvey.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Rainy; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Lupton.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C: Mr. Cave, Mr. George Faber, and Mr. Gretton; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Long, Earl Percy, and Mr. Abel Smith.

Reports to lie upon the Table 1383

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone) 1385
Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.) 1392

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"(*Viscount Castlereagh.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question.'"

Mr. Lardner (Monaghan, N.) 1398
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 1401
Sir Walter Nugent (Westmeath, S.) 1404
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) 1404
Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, S.) 1407
Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) 1411
Mr. Gordon (Londonderry, S.) 1414
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 1419
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1420
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1427

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 288; Noes, 49. (Division List, No. 371.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey) 1441
Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College) 1442

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. 1443
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) .. 1451
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) .. 1452
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) .. 1453
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) .. 1454
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) .. 1454
Mr. Higham (Yorks, W.R., Sowerby .. 1455
Mr. John Burns .. 1455

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. John Burns.*)

British North America Bill.—Order for the Lords' Amendments to be considered, read.

The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 1456

Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill.—Bill, as amended, considered.

The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. 1456

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a third time."—(*Mr. Lloyd George*).

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Prisons (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Redmond Barry*).

Lord R. Cecil .. 1457
The Solicitor-General for Ireland (Mr. Redmond Barrie, Tyrone, N.) 1457

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) .. 1457

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time"—(*Mr. Sinclair*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr Sinclair.*)

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Sinclair 1458

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time.—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Lord R. Cecil 1459
Mr. Sinclair 1460
Major Anstruther-Gray (*St. Andrews Burghs*) 1462
Mr. Cathcart Wason (*Orkney and Shetland*) 1262
Lord Balcarres 1463
Mr. Morton (*Sutherland*) 1463
Mr. Bowles (*Lambeth, Norwood*) 1464

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Employment of Women Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read.

The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 1465

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Akers-Douglas (*Kent, St. Augustine's*) 1465
Mr. Herbert Samuel 1466

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [Lords].—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 :—

Mr. Lloyd Morgan (*Carmarthenshire, W.*) 1467

August 5.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In line 14, after the word 'expedient,' to insert the words 'and shall if any county council having authority within the area of the proposed order directs.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd Morgan*).

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 37, after the word 'Conservators,' to insert the words 'or county councils.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Lord R. Cecil 1467
The Treasurer of the Household (*Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.*) 1468

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to insert the words "(b) and in the case of county councils out of the county funds.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Bowles 1468
Sir Edward Strachey 1468

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

Whereupon Mr. Deputy-Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Seven o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 5th AUGUST, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliament had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders in respect of the Amendments made in Committee of this House to the following Bill have not been complied with:—

Armagh Urban District Council.—The same was ordered to lie on the Table 1469

Armagh Urban District Council Bill.—Examiner's Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next 1469

Swansea Harbour Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons 1469

Aberdeen Corporation Electricity Bill [H.L.]; Midland Railway Bill; [H. L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments .. 1469

Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1469

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1469

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Brought from the Commons 1469

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmanion Bill.—Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 151) 1469

Dumbarton Burgh and County Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Dumbarton Burgh and County Tramways—Was presented by the Lord Granard (E. Granard) for the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7) deemed to have been read 2ª, and reported from the Committtee. (No. 152) .. 1469

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.—No. 532. Surveys of British Africa (Annual Report of the Colonial Survey Committee, second year, to July, 1907).

No. 533. Wei-hai-Wei (Report for 1906) 1470

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Memorandum on the teaching of drawing 1470

TUBERCULOSIS (HUMAN AND BOVINE) (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Appendix, Part II. (2 Vols.), to the second interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of human and animal tuberculosis 1470

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1907 1470

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.—Return of tenants (or their representatives) who had been evicted from three "Plan of Campaign" estates purchased or proposed to be purchased by the Estates Commissioners, and who have been reinstated in their former holdings or provided with other holdings .. 1470

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).—Annual Report of the Registrar-General, for the year, 1906 1470

August 5.] *Page*

Local Government Board.—Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1906–1907.

Presented (by Command) and ordered to lie on the Table 1470

Supreme Court of Judicature.—Rules of the Supreme Court. (August, 1907) 1471

Polling Districts (County of Stafford).—Order made by the Council of the county of Stafford, altering the Handsworth Sandwell (South) Polling District of the Handsworth Parliamentary Division of Staffordshire .. 1471

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post, New Zealand).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 9) Warrant, 1907, dated 19th July, 1907 1471

Land Registry.—Account of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1471

Chairman of Committees.—Moved, That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in the Committee of the whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committees (The Lord Privy Seal (*M. Ripon*); agreed to 1471

Criminal Appeal Bill. [Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1471

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 1473
Lord Ashbourne 1476
Lord Coleridge 1479
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1480
The Lord Chancellor 1482

On Question, Motion agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Married Women's Property Bill.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[Lord Balfour of Burleigh in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

The Lord Chancellor 1484

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 21, after the word 'marry' to insert the words 'or have married.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Lord Chancellor 1485

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 25, after the word 'husband' to insert the words 'contained in the settlement or agreement.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Lord Chancellor 1485

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, lines 25 and 26, to leave out the words 'larger than an estate or interest for his life,' and in line 27, after the word 'death,' to insert the words 'and which he could have bound or disposed of if this Act had not been passed.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 :—

The Lord Chancellor 1485

Amendment moved—

> "In page 2, line 16, after the word 'eight' to insert '(3) This Act shall not extend to Scotland.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 150.)

Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Steward (Earl Beauchamp) 1486

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

The Earl of Meath 1487

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Released Persons Poor Law Relief Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Earl Beauchamp 1488

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill.—Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

Lord Denman 1488

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out the word 'recognised,' and in line 12, after the word 'Act' to insert the words 'and approved of by the Lord-Lieutenant.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1488

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

THE SUGAR CONVENTION.

The Earl of Denbigh 1489
Lord Nunburnholme 1498
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Elgin*) 1501
The Marquess of Salisbury 1503
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) 1510

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [LORDS]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1513

National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.. .. 1513

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 1513

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—London County Council (Money) Bill; Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords] without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law in regard to Debentures and Debenture Stock of Companies. [Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill [Lords] 1513

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LAND REGISTRY.—Account presented, of Receipts and Payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 286] 1513

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Forty-third detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births, and Deaths in Ireland, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1514

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.—Copy presented, of Return of Tenants (or their representatives) who had been evicted from three "Plan of Campaign" estates purchased or proposed to be purchased by the Estates Commissioners, and who have been reinstated in their former holdings, or provided with other holdings [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1514

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Copy presented, of Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1514

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiry into Charities (County of Berks), Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 287] .. 1514

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) [EXPENSES].—Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred under any Act of the present session to regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Sinclair*) 1514

POOR LAW RELIEF (PAUPERS RELIEVED IN A YEAR AND PERIODS OF RELIEF.)—Return ordered, "showing, in respect of each Poor Law union in England and Wales, the total number of persons (excepting lunatics in county and borough asylums, registered hospitals, and licensed houses, and casual paupers) who were relieved by the guardians at any time during the twelve months ending the 30th day of September, 1907, classified according to (a) the aggregate length of time for which each person received relief, and (b) the number of times on which relief was granted to each person together with the following particulars respecting the persons so relieved:—(1) The number of men, women and children, respectively, distinguishing (a) persons relieved singly, and (b) heads of families and their dependents; and (2) The number of adults and children, respectively, who received (a) indoor relief only; (b) outdoor relief only, distinguishing persons who received only medical relief, and (c) both indoor and outdoor relief."—(*Mr. John Burns*) 1514

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

AMALGAMATION OF IRISH SMALL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1515

August 5.] *Page*

DISORDERLY HOUSES—REMOVAL OF GIRLS OVER FOURTEEN YEARS OF AGE.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1515

AUSTRALIAN MEAT PACKING ESTABLISHMENTS.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1516

TRANSFER OF MILITARY PAY DEPARTMENT FROM PONTEFRACT TO YORK.—Question, Mr. Nussey (Pontefract); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1516

WOOLWICH ARSENAL MEDALS FOR V. CHAPMAN AND OTHERS.—Question, Mr. Leverton Harris (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1517

AERIAL FLIGHT.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1517

RESERVE OF HORSES FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1517

MARRIAGE FEES IN MALTA.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1515

ALIENS DEPORTED.—Question, Mr. Thornton (Clapham); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1518

GUNS SENT TO ORDNANCE FACTORIES FOR REPAIRS.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1519

"RIDLEY" CLERKS AT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1519

FEES OF REVISING BARRISTERS.—Question, Mr. Cowan (Surrey, Guildford); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1520

INCOME TAX REBATES.—Question, Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1521

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF CONSOLS AND OTHER GOVERNMENT STOCKS.—Question, Mr. Hyde (Wednesbury); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1521

IRISH LAND COMMISSION BOOK-KEEPING.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1522

IMPROVEMENT OF SLIPS AT ROADS, (COUNTY KERRY).—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1522

REINSTATEMENT OF MR. THOMAS BROSNAN, OF DROMULTON.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1522

IRISH EDUCATION—APPOINTMENT OF JUNIOR INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1523

REPORT OF BELFAST HEALTH COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1523

IRISH GOVERNMENT BANKING BUSINESS.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1523

August 5.] Page

CHARGE AGAINST LISINISKA POLICE CONSTABLES.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1524

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1525

APPOINTMENTS OF CLERKS OF IRISH UNIONS.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1526

EVICTIONS OF CAPTAIN BOYCE'S ESTATE NEAR GALLOW.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1527

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT AND AUDIT FEES.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1528

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CLAIM OF MRS. DELANY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1528

DELAY IN SALE OF ESTATE OF CAPTAIN CALDBECK.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1529

PROMOTION OF IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1529

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

GREENWICH GENERATING STATION.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Captain Norton (Newington, W.) for Mr. Edmund Robertson) 1530

CAVALRY BARRACKS FOR SCOTLAND.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 1530

NEW CAVALRY SWORD.—Question, Major-Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1531

NEW BAYONET.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1531

TRANSVAAL LOAN.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1531

PAPERS ON THE TRANSVAAL LOAN.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1531

RAILWAYS IN NORTHERN NIGERIA.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1532

ORANGE RIVER UNION.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1532

BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside), Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1533

RAILWAY EXTENSION IN NIGERIA.—Questions, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe), Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1534

August 5.]

Page

BRUSSELS SUGAR CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. 1536

UNREST IN MOROCCO.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1536

CHARGE AGAINST CLERKENWELL POLICE.—Question, Mr. Radford (Islington, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1537

PASSIVE RESISTERS.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1537

GATESHEAD MOTOR DRIVING PROSECUTIONS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1537

SCRABSTER AND SCAPE MAIL BOAT.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Captain Norton 1538

WICK AND THURSO MAILS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Captain Norton 1539

MERIONETHSHIRE TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Questions, Rord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester), Sir William Anson (Oxford University); Answers, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 1539

CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CHURCH OF ENGLAND TRAINING COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1542

ARDGLASS HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1542

IMPORT JERQUING CLERKS.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan (Barrow-in-Furness); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1543

CUSTOMS UPPER SECTION CLERKS.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1543

CUSTOMS SURVEYORSHIPS' PROMOTIONS.—Question Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1543

CUSTOMS COLLECTORS.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1544

VALUATION OF SHEEP STOCKS IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) 1545

AILSA CRAIG RATING VALUATION.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1545

WHALE KILLING OFF SCOTLAND.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Lord R. Cecil; Answers, Mr. Sinclair 1546

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS FROM SCOTLAND TO IRELAND.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1546

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Bill.—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1547

Shetland Herring Fishery.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answers, Mr. Sinclair 1547

Kilneel Rural Council and the Labourers Acts.—Questions, MacVeagh and Mr. Moore; Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) 1547

Inspectors of Irish National Schools.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1548

Irish Grazing Dispute.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.) and Mr. Moore; Answers, Mr. Cherry 1549

Mr. Orpon's Brewsterfield (Kerry) Estate.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1550

Irish Agrarian Offences Returns.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answers, Mr. Cherry 1550

Agrarian Crime Trials.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. 1551

Irish Police.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Cherry 1551

Galway Assizes—Crime Returns.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1552

Kingston College, Mitchelstown.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1552

District Inspector Cruise, R.I.C.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1553

Police and Public Meetings in Cavan.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.), Mr. Flynn, and Mr. Moore; Answers, Mr. Cherry 1554

Mr. Reddy, M.P., and the Irish Lord Chancellor.—Question, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1556

Small Schools in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 1557

Labourers Acts Loans and Loan Capital Duty.—Questions, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.), and Mr. John Redmond; Answers, Mr. Asquith 1557

Irish Mail Service Subsidy.—Questions, Mr. Mooney (Newry), Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby), and Mr. John Redmond; Answers, Mr. Runciman 1558

Attack on Leitrim Postmen.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Captain Norton 1560

August 5.] Page

THE COMPANIES BILL.—Question, Sir J. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1561

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Questions, Mr. Morton and Lord R. Cecil; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1561

ANTICIPATORY MOTIONS.—Question, Mr. Bowles; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1561

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS BILL FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1561

GOVERNMENT AND THE FALL IN SECURITIES.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1562

THE CONDITION OF THE SHETLANDERS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1562

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Sir Ivor Herbert; and had reinstated on the Committee (previously discharged in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Dr. Macnamara.

Report to lie upon the Table 1563

Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301] 1563

ADJOURNMENT.

Lord ROBERT CECIL (Marylebone, E.) rose in his place, and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the failure of the Government to secure the due payment of the salaries o the teachers in the non-provided schools in Merionethshire"; but the pleasure of the the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen,

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter past Eight, this evening 1563

Small Landowners (Scotland) Bill (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1563

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Report stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill be brought to a conclusion in three allotted days; and (*a*) That the new Clauses and Clauses 1 to 6 of the Bill be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; and (*b*) That Clauses 7 to 15 of the Bill

(if and so far as not previously disposed of) be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day ; and (*c*) That the remaining Clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage of the Bill to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded with on the third allotted day and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day. Any day on which the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill is put down as the first Order of the day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order. At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, or if that day is Friday, at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on the any Clauses or Amendments moved by the Oovernment of which notice has been given (but no other Clauses or Amendments), and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new Clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be. Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order ' Time for taking Private Business,' be taken immediately after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order ' Sittings of the House.' At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the day, or if that day is a Friday or Saturday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill. After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill stand as first Order of the day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to re-commit the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate.—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1566
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 1574
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 1576
Mr. Munro-Ferguson (*Leith Burghs*) 1579
Mr. Lambton (*Durham, S.E.*) 1582
Mr. Mildmay (*Devonshire, Totnes*) 1585
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (*Lanarkshire, N.W.*) 1587
Mr. Pike Pease (*Darlington*) 1588
Mr. Stanley Wilson (*Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness*) 1590
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 1592
The Secretary for Scotland (*Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire*) 1599
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Croydon*) 1602
Mr. Laurence Hardy 1606
Mr. Younger (*Ayr Burghs*) 1607

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out ' three ' and insert ' five.' "—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

August 5.] Page

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1608
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1608
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1610

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 175 ; Noes, 59. (Division List No. 372.)

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1613
Sir F. Banbury 1613

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'day,' to insert the words 'none of which shall be a Friday or a Saturday.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1614

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Abel Smith (Herts, Hertford) 1615

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the words '1 to 6,' and to insert the words '1 and 2.'"—(*Mr. Abel Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'to 6' stand part of the Question.'"

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1615
Mr. Walter Long 1615

Amendment negatived.

Lord R. Cecil 1616
Sir F. Banbury 1617

Amendment proposed—

"In line 5, after the word 'day,' to insert the words, 'Provided that the new clauses shall be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion by 6 p.m., Clause 1 by 7 p.m., Clause 2 by 8 p.m., Clause 3 by 9 p.m., Clause 4 by 10 p.m., Clause 5 by 11 p.m., and Clause 6 by midnight.'"—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1618
Mr. Abel Smith 1618
Mr. Chaplin (Surrey, Wimbledon) 1619
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 1619

August 5.] *Page*
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1619
Mr. Leif Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*).. 1620

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 373.)

Main Question again proposed.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 177; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 374.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 375.)

Ordered, That the Report Stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill be brought to a conclusion in three allotted days; and—

(*a*) That the new clauses and Clauses 1 to 6 of the Bill be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; and

(*b*) That Clauses 7 to 15 of the Bill (if and so far as not previously disposed of) be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; and

(*c*) That the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report Stage of the Bill to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded with on the third allotted day and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

Any day on which the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any new clauses or Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other clauses or Amendments), and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided

by the Standing Order "Time for taking Private Business," be taken immediately after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, through opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order "Sittings of the House."

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday or Saturday at 5 p.m Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to recommit the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate.

NON-PROVIDED SCHOOLS IN MERIONETHSHIRE—TEACHERS' SALARIES (MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT.)

Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 1629
Mr. Lane Fox (*Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash.*) 1634

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 1639
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 1641
Mr. Osmond Williams (*Merionethshire*) 1645
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (*Aston Manor*) 1646
The Attorney-General (*Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.*) 1648
Mr. Lyttelton (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 1650
Mr. William Jones (*Carnarvonshire, Arfon*) 1653
Mr. Cave (*Surrey, Kingston*) 1655
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 1656
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) 1657
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1658

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 376.)

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1663

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Report Stage of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill be brought to a conclusion in three allotted days; and

(*a*) That the new clauses and Clauses 1 to 5 of the Bill be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; and

(*b*) That the clauses of the Bill following Clause 5 to the end of Part II. of the Bill (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded

with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; and

(*c*) That the remaining clauses of the Bill and the Schedules and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage of the Bill to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of) be proceeded with on the third allotted day, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

Any day on which the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this order.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any new clauses or Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other clauses or Amendments), and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

And Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order 'Time for taking Private Business,' be taken immediately after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order 'Sittings of the House.'

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday or Saturday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith any question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

After the passing of this order on any day on which any proceedings on the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to re-commit the Bill, nor Motion for adjournment under Standing Order 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. Chaplin (*Surrey, Wimbledon*) 1667

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Mr. Wyndham (*Dover*) 1667
Mr. Lane-Fox 1669
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1669
Mr. Chaplin 1670
Mr. Courthope (*Sussex, Rye*) 1670

August 5.]

Page
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1671
Mr. Lambton 1671
Mr. Mildmay 1672
Mr. Stanley Wilson 1672
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1673

Question, " That the debate be now adjourned," put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Council of India Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. 1673

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1674
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington Walworth) 1675
Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.) 1677

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.' "—(*Mr. Charles O'Donnell.*)

Question proposed, " That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1678
Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.) 1681
Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) 1682
Mr. Mooney (Newry) 1683
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1684
Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) 1685
Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.) 1686

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Tuesday. (*Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

Prisons (Ireland) Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed 1688

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill.—Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed 1688

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1688

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 6TH AUGUST, 1907.

The Earl COWLEY took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Moved that the order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bill read 2ª accordingly: Committee negatived .. 1689

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1689

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1689

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water Bill [H.L.]; Midland Railway Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered and agreed to 1689

Aberdeen Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 154).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Aberdeen Harbour 1689

Dumbarton Burgh Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 155).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Dumbarton Burgh 1689

Were presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7) deemed to have been read 2ª, and reported from the Committee 1689

PETITIONS.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (TONNAGE DEDUCTION FOR PROPELLING POWER) BILL.—Petitions to be heard by Counsel against; of Pilotage Authorities and Pilots of Ports in the Bristol Channel; Swansea Harbour Trustees; Taff Vale Railway Company; and Cardiff Railway Company.—Read and ordered to lie on the Table 1689

Lights on Vehicles Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 153) 1690

Post Office Sites Bill.—Reported, with an Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 1690

Prisons (Ireland) Bill (No. 156); Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties Bill) (No. 157).—Brought from the Commons; Read 1ª, and to be printed 1690

Merchant Shipping Acts Amentment Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 1690

Page

Fatal Accidents (Damages) Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Courtney of Penwith .. 1690

Moved, that the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh .. 1692

Moved to resolve, " That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill without more time for consideration of the subject than is provided between the 31st of July and the 6th of August."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

The Earl of Halsbury .. 1694
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) .. 1695
The Chairman of Committees (*The Earl of Onslow*) .. 1696

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) .. 1696

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Earl of Ccewe.*)

The Marquess of Lansdowne .. 1706
Lord Atkinson .. 1718
The Earl of Dunraven .. 1728
Lord Clonbrock .. 1742
Lord Barrymore .. 1746
The Earl of Arran .. 1753
The Marquess of Clanricarde .. 1759
Viscount Massereene .. 1762
Lord Denman .. 1764
The Earl of Mayo .. 1771
Lord Hemphill .. 1777
The Earl of Donoughmore .. 1782
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) .. 1792
Viscount Midleton .. 1795
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) .. 1802

Question put and agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

Married Women's Property Bill.—Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow .. 1805

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill; Kingwood (Whitfield Tabernacle Schoolroom, Etc.) Charity Bill; Longton (Caroline Street Street Chapel) Charity Bill).—Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed 1805

House adjourned at a quarter before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, at a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 6TH AUGUST, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [LORDS] (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1806

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [LORDS] (by Order).—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1806

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without amendment 1806

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill, Swansea Harbour Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to.—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords], Portishead District Water Bill [Lords], without Amendment .. 1806

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented—of Colonial Report, No. 533 (Weihaiwei, Report for 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1806

SHIPPING CASUALTIES (1905–6).—Copy presented—of Abstract of the Returns of Shipping Casualties which occurred on or near the Coasts or in Rivers and Harbours of the United Kingdom from the 1st July, 1905, to 30th June, 1906, and of the Returns of Shipping Casualties to British Vessels elsewhere than on the Coasts of the United Kingdom, and to Foreign Vessels on or near the Coasts, or in River and Harbours, of British Possessions Abroad, etc., with Charts and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1806

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

REDUCTION OF THE COASTGUARD SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1806

OBSERVANCE OF SAINTS' DAYS AT DITTON SCHOOL, ILMINSTER.—Question, Mr. Montgomery (Somersetshire, Bridgewater); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1807

PAINTING OF LETTER-BOXES.—Question, Mr. W. T. Wilson (Lancashire, Westhoughton); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1807

POLICE COMMISSION—CASE OF EX-CONSTABLE GEORGE DEED.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer, Sir John Walton 1808

IRISH TEACHERS' PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1808

PAYMENT OF DOCKYARD LABOURERS DOING SKILLED WORK. — Question, Mr. T. F. Richards (Wolverhampton); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. 1809

ASSESSMENTS IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw 1809

August 6.] Page

BEAUTIFYING TRAFALGAR SQUARE.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 1809

ORDERS FOR LEE-ENFIELD RIFLES AT ENFIELD SMALL ARMS FACTORY.—Question, Mr. Branch (Middlesex, Enfield); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1810

AUDIT DEPARTMENT—PROMOTION OF EXAMINERS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1810

PROMOTION IN THE COLONIAL AUDIT DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1810

PROMOTION IN AUDIT DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1811

INCOME OF LONDON NON-PROVIDED SCHOOLS.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1813

DRAINAGE OF BUILDINGS—CONTROL OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Question, Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 1813

DISCHARGES OF LABOURERS BY THE HAMPSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1814

ASSISTANCE TO THE BLIND IN LONDON.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, Mr. Secretary Gladstone 1814

EVICTED TENANTS—APPLICATION OF DENIS HEALY.—Question, Mr. John Murphy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1814

SALE OF UNTENANTED LAND ON THE BLACKER-DOUGLAS ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1815

SUGGESTED RAILWAY FROM LISTOWEL TO TARBERT.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1815

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

GERMAN NAVY BILL.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. 1816

COST OF REFITTING BATTLESHIPS.—Question, Mr. Holt (Northumberland, Hexham); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1861

BIRCHING IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1817

AYRSHIRE FOUNDRY CASTINGS.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1817

RAUNDS BOOT DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) 1818

WAR OFFICE SURVEYORS.—Question, Mr. Ridsdale (Brighton); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1818

ARMY CONTRACTS IN WALES.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1818

VICTORIA BARRACKS, WINDSOR.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1819

CARRICKFERGUS ORDNANCE DEPOT.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1819

LANMADAW EVICTIONS.—Questions, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire), Mr. Smeaton Stirlingshire); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 1820

YOUNG INDIANS IN ENGLAND.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Morley 1821

ARRESTS OF INDIAN EDITORS.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer Mr. Morley 1821

LAHORE RIOTERS' SENTENCES.—Question, Mr. O'Grady; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1821

BENGAL POLICE LIBEL ACTIONS.—Questions, Mr. O'Grady and Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answers, Mr. Morley 1822

PANAMA CANAL LABOUR.—Question, Mr. Staveley Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1823

CUSTOMS REBATES ON SOUTH AFRICAN WAR SUPPLIES.—Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1823

MR. CHURCHILL'S AFRICAN TOUR.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1824

UGANDA RAILWAY ANNUITIES.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1824

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND THE BRUSSELS CONVENTION.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1824

CONGO FREE STATE CONSULS.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1825

DENMARK AND ICELAND.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1825

NEW BARRACKS AT CAIRO.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1826

EGYPTIAN ARMY OF OCCUPATION—COST OF MOVING TROOPS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1826

EGYPTIAN COMPANY LAWS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1826

BRITISH REPRESENTATIVES ABROAD—PENSIONS AND EMOLUMENTS.—Question, Sir G. Kekewich (Exeter); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1827

August 6.] Page

Congo Free State Rubber Traffic—Subsidy to the African Steamship Company.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon; Answer, Captain Norton (Newington, W.) 1827

Newfoundland Fisheries Dispute.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1828

Price of Consols—Savings Bank Depositors.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent and Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 1829

Income-Tax Rebates.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1830

Exeter Income-Tax Distraint.—Questions, Sir G. Kekewich and Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answers, Mr. Asquith 1830

Mines Commisson and the North Wales Quarries.—Question, Mr. Ellis Davies (Carnarvonshire, Eifion); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1831

Shirley Poor Law Schools.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey), Mr. Harrold Cox; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1832

Coffee Adulterations.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 1832

Grant for the Distressed.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1832

Secondary School Regulations.—Question, Mr. Staveley-Hill; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 1834

Swansea Voluntary School Teachers.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Lough 1834

International Congress on School Hygiene.—Question, Sir G. Kekewich; Answer, Mr. Lough 1835

Board of Education Statistics.—Question, Sir G. Kekewich; Answer, Mr. Lough 1836

Crown Prosecutions in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Staveley-Hill; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) .. 1836

Edwards Estate, Monasterevan. — Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1837

Sir Antony MacDonnell.—Question, Mr. Staveley-Hill; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1837

Insanitary Houses at Kilrush.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1838

Administration of the Labourers Acts.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1838

Irish Poor Law Medical Service.—Question, Mr. Meagher; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1839

Page

KILMALLOCH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 1839

BALLINAMONA HOSPITAL LANDS, LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1840

KILCOLEMAN PATRICKSWELL EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answswer, Mr. Cherry 1840

KNOCKLONG EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. 1840

MANISTER EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. 1841

ERASMUS SMITH ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1841

DELMEGE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Lundon; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1842

POST OFFICE AND THE IRISH LAND STOCK.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1842

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILLS.—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 1843

LORD D'AUVERQUERQUE'S PENSION.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1844

CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1844

WILLIAM IV. CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1845

GEORGE IV. CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1846

ABSENT MINISTERS.—Questions, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Speaker 1846

THE BELFAST LABOUR DISPUTE.—Questions, Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow), Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Mr. Lundon, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.), Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), and Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answers, Mr. Cherry 1847

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) and of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bills)—Mr. Charles Craig; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) and of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bills)—Mr. William Moore.

Report to lie upon the Table] 1849

Education Administrative Provisions Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee B.

August 6.] Page

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 288.]

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 302] 1849

Prize Courts Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 304] 1849

Rule Committee Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 305] 1849

Factory and Workshop Bill—Copy ordered, "of Explanatory Statement of the Factory and Workshop Bill."—(*Mr. Samuel Herbert.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289] 1849

NEW BILL.

Motor Car (Collision and Accidents) Bill.—To define the liability of the owners or persons in charge of motor cars in cases of collision or accident, presented by Mr. Bertram, supported by Mr. Buckmaster, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Rogers, and Viscount Helmsley; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 303.] 1849

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 1849

New clause proposed—

> "Nothing contained in this Act or done in pursuance thereof shall prejudice, affect, or interfere with the sole exercise by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries of all powers and duties under the provisions and for the purposes of the diseases of Animals Acts."—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Secretary for Scotland (*Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire*) 1853
Mr. Lane-Fox (*Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash*) 1857
Mr. Courtney Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 1857
Viscount Helmsley (*Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk*) 1859
Mr. Everett (*Suffolk, Woodbridge*) 1861
Mr. Chaplin (*Surrey, Wimbledon*) 1861
Mr. Munro Ferguson (*Leith Burghs*) 1863
Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 1864
Sir J. Davies (*Inverness*) 1865
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1866
Mr. Molteno (*Dumfriesshire*) 1867
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 1869

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 120 ; Noes, 176. (Division List No. 377.)

Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 1873

New clause—

"When the landlord of a holding has agreed to sell such holding to the landholder in occupation thereof, it shall be lawful for the landlord or the landholder to apply to the Land Court to register the sale of such holding, and the Land Court shall thereafter determine and by order declare such holding to have ceased to be a holding within the meaning of this Act."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Brought up, and read a first time

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Sinclair 1875

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 1875

New clause—

"Where, owing to the failure of the landholder to bequeath his tenancy or of the legatee to accept the bequest, the right of the tenancy devolves upon the heir-at-law of the landholder, the landlord may give notice in writing to such heir requiring him to state whether or not he elects to accept the tenancy, and in case such heir shall not, within six weeks after the receipt of such notice, declare that he elects to accept the tenancy the tenancy shall be forfeited provided that if such heir be furth of the United Kingdom the Land Court may grant such extension of the period hereinbefore specified as may seem to them to be reasonable."—(*Mr. Younger.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Sinclair 1876
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1876
Mr. Younger 1877
Mr. Walter Long 1877

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 7, to leave out the words 'the tenancy shall be forfeited,' and to insert the words 'his rights in the tenancy shall pass to the next heir, and the same procedure shall apply.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

August 6.] Page

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

New clause—

"If a landholder either renounces or is removed from his holding while owing any arrears of rent to the landlord, the landlord shall be entitled to set off such arrears of rent, and also the rent of the outgoing crop, against any sum found to be due to the landholder or to the Agricultural Commissioners for improvements made on the holding."—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added to the Bill.

Clause 1:—

Mr. Walter Long 1878

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 8 and 9, to leave out the words 'and shall have effect throughout Scotland.'"—(*Mr. Long.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The Solicitor-General for Scotland (Mr. Ure, Linlithgowshire) 1880
Mr. Munro Ferguson 1882
Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.) 1883
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1887
The Lord-Advocate (Mr. Thos. Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 1890
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1891
Mr. Thos. Shaw 1891
Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) 1898
Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.) 1900
Mr. Abel Smith (Hertfordshire, Hereford) 1901
Sir J. Dewar (Inverness) 1903
Sir Henry Craik 1905
Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor) 1909
Sir F. Banbury 1910
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 1912
Viscount Helmsley 1914
Mr. Molteno 1918
Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 1921
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 1926

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 5th August, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

The House divided:—Ayes, 263; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 378.)

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, to leave out the words 'the date of.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out the words 'the date of.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'and,' and insert the words 'or within two miles from the holding, and by himself or his family'"—(*Mr. Sinclair*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 268; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 379.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the words 'the date of.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'and,' and insert the words or within two miles from the holding, and by himself or his family'"—(*Mr. Sinclair*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 268; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 380.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 8, to leave out from the word 'leaseholder,' to end of line 14."

"In page 2, lines 22 and 23, to leave out the words 'their respective statutory successors,' and insert the words 'the successors of every such person in the holding, being his heirs or legatees.'"

"In page 3, line 18, to leave out the words 'immediately before,' and insert the word 'at.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be further considered To-morrow.

August 6.] *Page*

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill (BY ORDER).—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed [23rd July], on Consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 2, to leave out lines 24 and 25"—(*Dr. Cooper*).

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Burdett-Coutts (*Westminster*) 1941
Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 1942

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 8, to leave out the word 'three,' and insert the word 'two'"—(*Mr. Burdett-Coutts*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Barnard (*Kidderminster*) 1943
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 1943
Mr. Morton (*Sutherland*) 1944
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. John Burns, Battersea*) 1944
Mr. Courthope, (*Sussex, Rye*) 1944
Mr. Waterlow (*Islington, N.*) 1945
Mr. Luke White (*Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose*) 1946

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 184; Noes, 24. (Division List No. 381.)

Sir F. Banbury 1947
Mr. Courthope 1948

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 12, to leave out the words 'twenty per centum, or more than.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Luke White 1949
Mr. Morton 1950

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 173; Noes, 20. (Division List No. 382.)

Mr. Cooper (*Southwark, Bermondsey*) 1951
Mr. Morton 1954

August 6.] *Page*

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 8, to leave out lines 8, 9, 10 and 11, and to insert the words 'The charge for any supply furnished by the Board under the last preceding subsection of this section shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, be the fixed rate of eightpence per thousand gallons.' "—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Waterlow 1954

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 32, at the end, to insert the words: '(5) Provided always that, if at any time after the expiration of five years from the passing of this Act the council of any administrative county which, or any part of which, is within the limits of supply, or the local authority of any borough or district which, or any part of which, is within the limits of supply shall make a representation to the Local Government Board that the prices authorised by this Act to be charged for a supply of water for domestic purposes or by measure ought to be altered the Local Government Board, after such inquiry as they may think fit, may make an order varying the prices which the Board may charge for a supply of water for domestic purposes or by measure, or substituting other prices in lieu thereof, and the prices so varied or substituted shall have effect on and after such day as may be mentioned in the order as if they had been stated in this Act, and the prices for the time being in force may be altered in like manner at any time after the expiration of any or every period of five years after they were last altered.' "—(*Mr. Nield.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. John Burns 1958
Mr. Morton 1959

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Bowles 1960

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 37, to leave out the words 'Board so determine they may,' and insert the words 'builder shall in writing so require the Board shall'—(*Mr. Bowles*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Luke White 1961

Amendment negatived. —

Dr. Cooper .. 1962
Mr. Waterlow .. 1963
Mr. John Burns .. 1963
Mr. Burdett-Coutts .. 1964
Dr. Cooper .. 1964
Mr. Wood (Glasgow, St. Rollox) .. 1964
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.) .. 1965
Mr. Rawlinson .. 1965
Mr. Barnard .. 1966

Question, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Mr. John Burns .. 1967

Amendments agreed to.

Dr. Cooper .. 1967

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 15, line 10, to leave out Clause 33."—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Nield .. 1967

Bill to be read the third time.

Council of India Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth) .. 1968

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chancellor do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. 1968
Mr. Morton .. 1969

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. C. J. O'Donnell .. 1969

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out from the words 'consist of' to the end, and to insert the words 'fifteen members of whom not more than eight shall have held salaried appointments under the Government of India in the civil or military services of the Crown.' "

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Morley 1970
Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) 1971
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1974
Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) 1975
Mr. Lupton 1977
Mr. Morton 1977

Question, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.) 1978
Mr. Morley 1979

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. C. J. O'Donnell 1980
Mr. Morley 1981
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) 1981
Mr. C. J. O'Donnell 1982

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Mr. Mooney (Newry) 1982
Mr. Morley 1985

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir J. Jardine 1986

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported, without Amendment, read the third time and passed.

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) EXPENSES.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred by the Fishery Board for Scotland in pursuance of any Act of the present session to regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland."

Mr. Morton 1987
Mr. Rawlinson 1987
Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) 1988

August 6.]

Page

Mr. Akers-Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine's) 1989
Mr. Morton 1989
Lord R. Cecil 1990

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 13 ; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 383.)

Main question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow (Wednesday).

Employment of Women Bill [Lords].—Considered in Committee, and reported ; read the third time and passed, without Amendment.

Factory and Workshop Bill [Lords].—Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1991

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Akers-Douglas 1995
Mr. Gill (Bolton) 1997
Lord Edmund Talbot (Sussex, Chichester) 1998
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 1998
Mr. A. C. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) 2000

Question put, and agreed to. Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

Whereupon Mr. Deputy-Speaker, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute before Three o'clock a.m.

End of Table of Contents to Vol. CLXXIX.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SEVENTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 25th July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 20th day of March last "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to: Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill (Chelmsford Order); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13 Bill (Norwich Order); London County Council (General Powers) Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.):—

D. Sutherland,
E. Dartrey (chairman),
L. Abinger,
L. Seaton,
L. Armstrong;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly: The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Board of

Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill.—House in Committee (according to order): Bills reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle Schoolroom, etc.) Charity Bill; Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway (General Powers) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Borthwick and the Lord Oriel (*V. Massereene*) be proposed to the House as members of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Manners and the Lord Lyveden read, and agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 529. Gibraltar (Report for 1906).

AUSTRALIA.

Report upon the conditions and prospects of British trade in Australia, by the Advisory Committee on Commercial Intelligence of the Board of Trade. Based upon information collected by their Commissioner, Mr. R. J. Jeffray.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

List of public elementary schools and certified efficient schools in Wales (including Monmouthshire) on 1st August, 1906.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Report of proceedings at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888. Tuesday, 2nd July, 1907.

ASTRONOMER ROYAL (GREENWICH OBSERVATORY).

Report of the Astronomer Royal to the board of visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, read at the annual visitation of the Royal Observatory, 8th June, 1907.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3869. Egypt (Alexandria).

No. 3870. France (St. Pierre and Miquelon).

No. 3871. United States (Finances of the United States for the year 1906).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I almost feel that some apology is due from me for the fact that I am in charge of this Bill, because it is practically a Government measure. The clauses in the Bill cover 103 lines, of which seventy-one, or over 70 per cent., represent Amendments introduced in another place on the Motion of Mr. Herbert Samuel, the representative of the Government. It is a Bill for which I hope I shall be able to show there is considerable necessity, and it will, I believe, be of considerable value in protecting the public. The present condition of affairs, as I understand it, is that whereas motorists and cyclists are under certain statutory obligations to provide themselves with and to use a lamp or lamps at certain times, other vehicles are merely subject to by-laws whenever they happen to be made. These by-laws differ very much in different parts of the country, as has been proved by Papers which have been laid before Parliament. This is not a motorists Bill—I am not the proud owner of a motor-car myself—but it arises from the enormous number of accidents that occur to all classes of vehicles through the absence of lights. I have here a shoal of cases, a great many of the Papers in my hand comprising records of accidents all over the country due entirely to the absence of lights on the public roads at night. There are accidents between motors and motors, between motors and other vehicles, between cycles and other vehicles, between traps and traps, and between carts and pedestrians, and as I have said they come from all over the country. In view of the important debate which is to come on in the course of this sitting, I will not go into the cases in detail, but I do not think it will be denied that accidents are frequently occurring through the absence of any provisions such as are ordained by this Bill. Everybody complains of the fact. This Bill is supported by three or four very powerful associations, who obviously have based their support on wide experience. I have Papers which show that the Bill is supported by the Motor Union, by the Roads Improvement Association, which works in conjunction with the Motor Union, by the Cyclists Touring Club, representing 32,000 cyclists, by the Central Chamber of Agriculture, which thought it worth while to issue a whip in favour of the Bill when it was down for consideration on Second Reading in another place; it is also supported by several municipalities and by the Urban District Councils Association, whose only objection to it seems to be that it does not in their view go far enough. Therefore, I think I have not been exaggerating in saying that almost everybody—at any rate a very considerable section of the public—is in favour of the Bill.

I will go very briefly through the main provisions of the Bill. The first clause enacts that lights are to be carried by vehicles at night, which is more or less from one hour after sunset to one hour before sunrise. That is the same provision as is necessary for motor-cars. It also makes it necessary for any vehicle the contents of which extend to any considerable length to carry a tail light, and it ordains that lights shall always be kept properly lighted and trimmed. Clause 2 provides for the provision of penalties. Clause 3 gives power to make exceptions. There are certain cases in which exceptions are necessary. Your Lordships will see that Sub-section 5 makes an exception in favour of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board. The Liverpool Docks are very largely used by carriers of cotton, and cotton and other goods of that inflammable nature should receive special protection at all times. Therefore, power is given to except cases in which the use of a light continually would be dangerous. Clause 4 defines what a vehicle is and repeals existing by-laws, the object being to secure uniformity throughout the length and breadth of the country. That is practically the whole Bill; at any rate those are the main principles of the measure. As far as we know there are no opposing voices, the few objections that were made in another place having been, I think, generously met by the promoters. The Bill left the House of Commons with the unanimous recommendation of that body, no dissentient voice being raised against it. It is difficult to understand why legislation of this kind has been for so long delayed. I believe the Bill will result in very little hardship to individuals, and it will be a very great advantage to the public safety, and it is for these reasons I ask your Lordships to read it a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Viscount St. ALDWYN: Before this Bill is read a second time there is one small point to which I should like to call attention. The Bill provides for an exception being made from the provision that lights shall be necessary, in favour of farmers during what may be called the harvest months, when the road passes through a farm which the farmer occupies. It is quite necessary that there should be some such exception, for it would be absurd and even dangerous to require a farmer to put lights on a wagon carrying hay, or straw, or corn. Of course, such traffic should be exempt from any such provisions. But I do not think that in the Bill as it stands the exemption is quite wide enough. I think some provision should be inserted to extend it to other months, which will include the hay harvest, for example. I merely commend that point to the attention of my noble friend.

Lord AVEBURY: I have no desire to enter any opposition to this Bill, but I have had representations from the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce and other bodies in Liverpool with reference to the particular area adjoining the Liverpool Docks. There are about seven miles of road there which are very brilliantly lighted, and these bodies submit that it is quite unnecessary for carts in that particular district to carry lights. They are very anxious that the local authority should have power to exempt that area from the provisions of the Bill. No doubt there is a provision enabling local authorities to exempt particular carts, but very often the carter in this instance really does not know whether his cart contains imflammable material or not, and the Liverpool bodies to which I refer think it extremely desirable in the interests of public safety and the trade of the port that there should be power to the local authority to exempt the seven miles of road along the Liverpool Docks. There may probably be other cases of the same character elsewhere, and I will ask my noble friend before we go into Committee to consider the representations which have been made in this respect.

Earl RUSSELL: My Lords, legislation of this important character has been long desired by a large number of people, and not only by those who are concerned with motors. This Bill has passed the other House, as was truly said by Lord Donoughmore, with general assent. Of course, at this period of the session it is not possible to amend a Bill of this kind to any extent, although I may say there are some Amendments which I should have liked to have seen made. For instance, the Bill does not provide that as a matter of course vehicles shall show a red light in the rear, but it does provide that if the lamp is constructed to show a light at the back that light shall be red. I think we may assume that in regard to all vehicles that use the roads regularly—not agricultural vehicles travelling from one field to another—they will be fitted with lamps, and it will probably be found just as cheap in practice to provide in the lamp a little circle of red glass at the back which will effect the object desired. There is one immense advantage in this legislation, and that is that it secures uniformity. Not only are all vehicles to be lighted, but the regulations are to be uniform. At present the various by-laws in force in different parts of the country vary among themselves in many ways, and people who go from one district to another can hardly tell for certain whether they are observing the by-laws in force in that particular district or not. For instance, in a parish of Lincolnshire, I happen to know that a very serious accident was caused upon the Great North Road owing to the local regulation not requiring a vehicle to be lighted at all during the summer months. In consequence a vehicle was quite invisible to another and thereby a serious accident was caused. Your Lordships may be sure that the result of this legislation will be to save several lives and a great deal of property every year. Therefore, I hope the Bill will pass into law this session.

Earl BEAUCHAMP: I rise on behalf of the Home Office merely to say that they will be very glad indeed to see this Bill pass into law, and to assist the noble Earl in achieving that result. I have very little doubt that as a result of negotiations arrangements will easily be made to meet the various points raised by the noble Viscount and the noble Lord opposite. Your Lordships will be able to deal satisfactorily with these matters in Committee. Perhaps the main benefit which this Bill will confer is that mentioned by the noble Earl behind me—that of securing uniformity throughout the country. It is really a curious study to see a map of the country with the various counties marked according to the different by-laws which they enforce. I have no doubt at all that the enforcement of uniformity in this direction will be a very great boon to all those who use the roads of the country.

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

LEEDS (SOUTH PARADE CHAPEL) CHARITY BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord WEARDALE: My Lords, this is one of three Bills which have been introduced by the Charity Commissioners and passed through the other House. The first Bill, the Second Reading of which is now asked for, and the next two Bills on the Paper—the Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle School Room, etc.) Charity Bill and the Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill—are all based on the same principle, and the reasons for intorducing them will be found in the Report of the Charity Commissioners, in which it is said that the main object of the scheme in each case is to authorise the variation of the trusts so as to bring them into accordance with the doctrine generally held at the present time by the congregation or denomination to which the chapel belongs. In that Report a very lucid explanation will be found of the grounds in each case on which the Bills have been drawn. They have passed through the House of Commons without any opposition, and without any kind of objection on the part of the interests affected. Therefore, I do not think I need trouble your Lordships with any further explanation. I will simply ask that the Bill may now be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Weardale.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, these schemes are of a very interesting character, because, although they proceed upon the Motion of my noble friend opposite they are strictly denominational in every respect. I gather that under these schemes it is sought to fix by Act of Parliament what religious doctrine shall be taught in connection with the particular property with which each scheme deals. I am glad to find that the Church of England is not the only denomination that has to come to Parliament for sanction to deal with its own property, and that, notwithstanding what is supposed to be the comparative freedom of the non-established religious bodies, they also have to depend upon Parliament for the disposal of their property. Another striking circumstance with regard to the present Motion of the noble Lord opposite is that the Motion is not made by an official Member of your Lordships' House. Although this Bill deals with the rights of property of the particular denomination concerned, the Motion is made upon the responsibility of a private Peer. Although I do not imagine for a moment that any private Peer could have been selected by the Charity Commissioners who would more deserve the confidence of your Lordships' House, still it is a striking circumstance that the Bill has not been moved upon the official responsibility of the Government. The Bill is a very detailed matter and depends upon a certain Report of the Charity Commissioners. I do not pretend to have made myself familiar with that Report, but I would ask that, before we proceed with the further stages of the Bill, the noble Lord should give us time to realise what is in that Report. I notice one very significant clause in the Schedule of one of the Bills—"Indemnity to non-consenting trustees." That may be merely common form, in which case there is no more to be said about it; but if it is intended to cover a difference of opinion in the denomination itself about which Parliament is asked to decide one way or another, then it is a matter of some importance and will require consideration We ought to know what these dissenting trustees have to say for themselves, and I merely ask that the noble Lord shall not take the next stage of the Bill until we have had an opportunity of considering it.

LORD WEARDALE: The Committee stage of the Bill shall be fixed to meet the convenience of the noble Marquess opposite.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: This Bill has already passed your Lordships' House, and I think the noble Lord the Marquess of Salisbury can claim the parentage of it. It was passed again last year, when the late Lord Davey, whose decease has been a great loss to your Lordships' House, was one of its strong supporters. It has also passed a Select Committee of this House. It was not supposed to have much chance, but, fortunately, through the diligence of a private Member, it has found its way through all its stages unaltered in the other House, and I hope your Lordships will now be able to finish the work which you have already endeavoured to accomplish in former years.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord ASHBOURNE: I see no objection to the substance of this Bill, but I would ask my noble friend to get the draftsman to run his eye over the first two paragraphs, because the phraseology appears to me to be more like that of a memorandum than of an Act of Parliament. It plunges at once into a general statement—

> "A married woman is able, without her husband, to dispose of, etc."

It states the result of an Act of Parliament, not the Act itself. The next section also is more in the language of a memorandum—

> "This section operates to render valid and confirm all such dispositions,"

and so on. I am sure the Bill has been placed before your Lordships in absolute good faith by my noble and learned friend, but I think some attention should be given to the phraseology.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: I will leave the parents of the Bill to defend their offspring. I believe it is the outcome of a Select Committee of your Lordships' House. I was not a Member of that Select Committee, and I cannot commit myself to saying whether I approbate or reprobate the language used; but certainly we shall be most happy to consider any objections or criticisms which may be made. After what has been said I will look into it again, but it is exactly the same Bill that was passed before, and the other House have returned it unaltered. Therefore I hope we shall not lightly depart from it.

Lord ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I decline to be regarded as a fault-finder. In the most innocent way I called attention to the phraseology of two paragraphs. But if my noble and learned friend tells me that he is satisfied, and the House of Commons were satisfied, I shall not make any great disturbance over the matter. But, certainly, the phraseology to which I have directed attention is not usually found in Acts of Parliament, and I merely suggest that before it is too late the draftsman should be asked to take a hurried look over it.

Lord Loreburn.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

IMPORTED WATCH CASES BILL.

Read 3ª, (according to order), and passed.

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.]

Read 3ª, (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

THE MILK SUPPLY.

Lord KENYON rose to ask the Minister of Agriculture what course the Government propose to take in regard to legislation affecting the dairy industry, and in response to the deputation which waited upon the Board of Agriculture on 27th February last. The noble Lord said: My Lords, I crave your indulgence for a few minutes while I try to explain the Question which stands in my name. First of all, I must say how sorry I am that Lord Carrington, to whom the Question is addressed, is not able to be present, because he is suffering from a cold; but I understand that the noble Lord who represents the Local Government Board is prepared to give a reply. In February of this year a very important deputation waited upon the Board of Agriculture. That deputation consisted of representatives of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, of the leading dairy associations, of forty-six affiliated societies, and sixteen outside bodies, their object being to try to secure from the Government a promise of legislation which would affect the distribution of milk all over the country. They felt, in the first place, that it was the desire of everybody that the milk supply of the kingdom should be pure, and that the present Model Milk Clauses, which were the outcome of an inquiry held in 1899, had not in anybody's opinion succeeded in effecting this object. The cause of this is that the clauses are not compulsory. Although they may be applied in one district, there is no reason why the animals affected should not be moved to another part of the country. I do not wish to go into the question as to whether milk from a tuberculous cow is dangerous to human beings or not, but I think it is quite reasonable to assume that it is not and cannot be a wholesome food for anybody. What the deputation desired I would like to read to you in a very few words from the report of the deputation. Mr. Middleton, representing the Central Chamber of Agriculture, said—

> " We earnestly hope that at an early date the Government will take upon themselves the duty of passing a comprehensive measure relating to the control and the production and the sale of milk. We consider that the Dairies, Cow-sheds, and Milkshops Orders of 1885 and 1889, if carried out, fairly meet the case and are ample protection, but they are not adopted everywhere. We ask that they should be made compulsory and should be strictly enforced throughout the whole country under the supervision and control of a Government Department."

Mr. James Sadler who also represented the Central Chamber of Agriculture and the Cheshire milk producers, said—

> "In one important particular we are of opinion that the model clauses do not go far enough. They give power to inspect the cattle, they give power to sample the milk, they give power to isolate the cows the udders of which are suspicious, but they do not give power to slaughter the animal. The net result of this is that the cow that has been isolated and cast out from one herd may quite easily be drafted into another dairy herd, and the milk from that condemned cow may find its way after all into the milk supply. Now, whether it is true or not that tuberculosis can be conveyed through the medium of cow's milk to human beings, I am not going to presume to offer an opinion on. What we say is this: that the tuberculous milk, whatever else may be said of it, cannot be regarded as wholesome, and therefore it ought not to be sold for human food. Therefore every cow that by any possibility can give tuberculous milk ought to be immediately slaughtered. We would therefore advocate that power should be given in a general Bill promoted by the Government, and backed by the Board of Agriculture, that all cows which show symptoms of tuberculosis of the udder should be immediately slaughtered; that, having been slaughtered, compensation should be paid for them out of Imperial funds."

On such lines as these we hope the Government will introduce a Bill very soon. The various bodies concerned are anxious for some legislation, and I trust that we shall receive a favourable reply.

*LORD ALLENDALE: My Lords, I have been asked to reply to the noble Lord's Question in the absence of my noble friend Lord Carrington, and also partly because the Question is to a large extent concerned with the question of public health as well as the dairy industry. In fact the main points raised by the deputation which waited on the President of the Board of Agriculture, from the report of which the noble Lord has read some extracts, concern the Local Government Board rather more than the Board of Agriculture. The deputation to which the noble Lord has referred urged that there should be an end of piecemeal legislation on the subject of milk supply. I think most of us will be agreed that this is very desirable. As your Lordships are aware, there is a series of clauses known as the Model Milk Clauses, which have been inserted in a number of local Acts dealing with the subject of milk, and are specially intended to guard against the risk of the spread of tuberculosis through the consumption of milk from diseased cows. Whether they have that effect entirely I would not like to say; but I am rather inclined to agree with Lord Kenyon that they have not secured that result as far as we might desire.

The deputation urged that any further legislation on the subject should be dealt with in a Government measure applicable to the whole country. They went so far as to suggest that cows even suspected of suffering from tuberculosis of the udder should be slaughtered and compensation paid out of Imperial funds. On that point, raised by Mr. Sadler, I will not follow the noble Lord. It is a large and rather a thorny question, and I have often heard it discussed in another place when the question of compensation under local corporations' private Bills was being considered. That certainly is a matter on which the Treasury would have a good deal to say, and I am not prepared to follow the noble Lord in regard to it at present. There are also in force Orders made under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts, 1878 and 1886. These Orders, made by the Local Government Board and their predecessors (the Privy Council), are called the Daries, Cowsheds, and Milkshops Orders, and relate to various matters with respect to dairies and cowsheds and the sale of milk, and empower local authorities to make regulations on these subjects. All these matters are referred to in the report from which the noble Lord opposite has quoted. Some of the points urged by the deputation were not so strictly concerned with matters of public health, but the other points which are have received and are receiving the attention of the Local Government Board. Moreover, the attention of the Board has in other ways been drawn to the subject and especially by the second interim Report of the Royal Commission on Human and Animal Tuberculosis, issued at the beginning of this year, in which the Commissioners state that—

> "A very considerable amount of disease and loss of life, especially among the young, must be attributed to the consumption of cows' milk containing tubercle bacilli."

They add that their results clearly point to the necessity of measures more stringent than those at present enforced being taken to prevent the sale or consumption of such milk.

All this is receiving the careful attention of the Local Government Board, who have come to the conclusion that legislation at an early date should be undertaken by the Government on the subject of milk supply, and they propose during the recess, in consultation with the Board of Agriculture, to give their careful consideration to the whole question, but of course where the question of compensation is concerned the Treasury would have to assent. I cannot pledge the Government or the Local Government Board as to the exact proposals of any measure which they may introduce. In framing their proposals their object will be, whilst doing what they can to secure the purity of the milk supply, not to press unduly on the dairy industry. All the points urged by the deputation are engaging the earnest and careful consideration of the Local Government Board and will continue to do so in the preparation of their Bill. But it must not be understood that the Government commit themselves to the acceptance of the suggestions, or of any particular suggestion put forward by the deputation.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I think the announcement which the noble Lord has made will give a measure of satisfaction to those who are interested in this question. It is a question of very great importance, not only to the business mainly concerned, but also to the health of the population at large, and I am sure that the House will welcome the announcement that His Majesty's Government intend to deal with the subject at an early date. But there was one matter mentioned by my noble friend behind me, namely, as to the compensation to be paid for cows which may be found to be affected with tuberculosis, to which the noble Lord opposite did not refer further than to say he did not intend to follow my noble friend into the question. But that is one of the most important questions that can be dealt with, and we should like to know what is the view of the Government upon it. Is the cost of compensation for the animal slaughtered to fall upon the taxpayer or upon the ratepayer in the locality concerned? Your Lordships may be aware that in London the London County Council alone amongst all the authorities has an Act of Parliament which enables it to give compensation, not for the whole but for a proportion of the value of the animal destroyed. I very much hope that the Local Government Board, when they are dealing with this matter, will very carefully consider the question upon whom the cost of compensation is to fall.

The noble Lord referred to what are known as the Model Milk Clauses. These clauses were settled after very careful consideration by the parties concerned, and in my Department of the Private Bill Office we have always closely scrutinised any attempt to depart from the Model Clauses which were agreed upon at that conference. They have never been departed from until this year, when the London County Council introduced a Bill in which they proposed to give compensation to the dairyman when he is summoned to come up to London to give evidence. That was a concession to the dairying interest to which I did not feel justified in offering any opposition. But until the Government introduces some general legislation dealing with the whole subject, I very much hope that your Lordships and the other House of Parliament will not materially interfere with the Model Milk Clauses. I will not go into the general question now, though it is a very interesting and important one. I will merely say that I hope the Government will deal with it at an early date. A general Bill was introduced in which this question would have been dealt with, but I understand that at the instance of the Local Government Board it was taken out of that Bill on the understanding that the Local Government Board would deal with the matter at an early date, and I hope your Lordships will see a Bill dealing with the whole subject placed upon the Table early next Session.

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY rose to draw attention to the recent action of the Government, and to ask:—(1) Whether the Board of Education will have any legal power to distribute to local authorities any part of the sum of £100,000, recently voted for providing new public elementary schools, until Section 96 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, has been repealed; and (2) Upon what grounds, educational or otherwise, the Board of Education have reversed their policy of neutrality in religious matters in the sphere of secondary education by their recent regulations for secondary schools and training colleges. The noble Marquess said: I rise to ask His Majesty's Government the Questions standing in my name, and in doing so I think it is hardly necessary for me to impress upon your Lordships the great importance that I lay on the two Questions of which I have given notice, because the Board of Education have recently taken action on totally new and novel lines. As these lines were, as far as I have been able to ascertain, entirely without precedent, I considered it to be my duty as a past Minister for Education to take the first opportunity of raising this important question in your Lordships' House, and thereby not only to endeavour to extract some explanation from His Majesty's Government, but also to draw the attention of the country to what I think is a most remarkable course of action. Your Lordships will have noticed that I have put down my two Questions under one heading. I have done that because the session was drawing to a close, and I thought that we might be limited with regard to time, and that consequently it might better suit your Lordships to discuss the two Questions on the same day. I trust, however, that those who reply to my Questions will deal with them fully and clearly and separately, as they are not in any way connected one with the other except by the fact that they are both associated with the Board of Education. I trust, therefore, that it will be fully explained to us on what principle the Board of Education have acted in these matters, whether they are acting with perfect legality, and what will be the method of the administration of these new rules and regulations.

I will take first the question of the proposed sum of money which is to be given for the building of public elementary schools. I at once say that I do not cavil at that proposal in the least. I am one of those—and I believe I speak for others on this side of the House—who recognise that in single school areas—whether the single school is denominational or undenominational—there is a certain amount of hardship. We recognise that fully; we do not disguise it. But what I wish to ask His Majesty's Government is how they propose to spend this £100,000. Is it to be given fairly and impartially to denominational single school areas and undenominational single school areas, or is it to be kept simply to erect council schools in denominational single schools areas for the purpose of squeezing out the denominational school? That is a question which the noble Lord opposite will not wonder at my asking, and it is one to which I think I have a right to expect a full reply.

Then I turn to the manner in which this £100,000 has been obtained. I say that the manner in which this money has been obtained is without precedent and unconstitutional, and, in my opinion the distribution of the money as the law at present stands will be illegal. This is a point I would particularly put to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. I commence by saying that the procedure in obtaining this £100,000 is unconstitutional. I remember well—I was not a member of the Government—but in 1897 when the Parliamentary grants were given there were two Bills, one to assist necessitous voluntary schools and the other to assist necessitous board schools. On each of those measures the question was discussed at great length—I believe, speaking from memory, that the discussion occupied something like twenty-two days. The question of obtaining £100,000 for this purpose would not have taken that length of time, and I want to know why this unconstitutional method was adopted instead of bringing the matter before Parliament and obtaining the money in the ordinary way.

I say, further, that I doubt the legality of the proceeding of the House of Commons. Section 96 of the Education Act of 1870 lays it down that no Parliamentary grant shall be made in aid of building, enlarging, improving, or fitting up any elementary school. In March last, when this question was raised in the House of Commons, this was pointed out very strongly to the President of the Board of Education, and it was declared that the Vote was illegal until that section had been repealed. In the course of the debate Mr. McKenna, and also the Attorney-General, expressed considerable doubt as to whether they were acting legally in thus obtaining the money. I have epitomised what I gather from their speeches, and I think they admitted that the mere Vote would not by itself entitle money to be paid to any local authority, but at the same time they mooted the theory that the matter would be put right by the Appropriation Act, which would provide that the money voted should be appropriated to the purpose for which it was voted. Later in the debate Mr. McKenna seems to have resolved definitely to take up the position that the expenditure would be legal, thanks to the Appropriation Act, but the legality only applies to the particular sum voted, and the section of the Act of 1870 remains in force. That is a question I put to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. I venture to say that the Appropriation Act has never before been used for any such purpose, and what I wish to ask is, if the Appropriation Act enables Mr. McKenna to obtain this £100,000 from the Consolidated Fund to the Treasury and from the Treasury to the Board of Education, and if the clause to which I have referred holds good, are the Board of Education justified in distributing that £100,000 to the local authorities exactly as they think fit? When we have this difference of opinion and this uncertainty as to the legality of the action of the Board, I think I have a right to ask the question, and the noble and learned Lord would be the last to deny it.

I now turn to what I think is the more important and serious part of my question, and that is the new principle involved in the regulations recently issued by the Board of Education. In the first place, what I find fault with chiefly in the proposed change is that for the first time in our educational history there is introduced into colleges and schools other than elementary, the principle of religious strife. We have all regretted for many years past that there has been considerable religious strife in elementary education; but I am thankful to think that up to the present there has never been any religious strife in the secondary schools and training colleges. On what grounds then is this new element to be introduced into these other spheres of education? I have frequently heard different classes of the community uttering expressions of hope that the religious controversy would be brought to an end. No one has more cordially concurred in this hope than I have, but I want to point out that so far from bringing the religious trouble to an end the action of

The Marquess of Londonderry.

the Government under these regulations will introduce this controversial spirit in regard to religion into the training colleges and secondary schools. On this point I would ask the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council, who—I know he will not repudiate it—with his colleagues is responsible for the action of the President of the Board of Education, upon whose advice did the right hon. Gentleman act when he submitted these proposed changes to his colleagues? Whom did he consult? Having myself been President of the Board of Education, I know full well that many sources of advice of a most valuable character are always open to the President of the Board of Education. There is the Consultative Committee, a most able body, composed of people fully qualified and occupying responsible positions, who devote their time, energy, and convenience to the consideration of any question that may be submitted to them by the President of the Board of Education. I speak from experience on that point. Did the President of the Board consult the Consultative Committee before he made his alteration in the regulations? In dealing with the secondary schools, it would have been perfectly possible, and I think it would be his duty, to consult the headmasters of the various grammar schools in the country. There is such a body who could have given him most useful advice. Did the right hon. Gentleman consult that body? Again, the right hon. Gentleman has many experts whom he can consult on these points. I ask, did he consult any of them, because innovations such as these in our system of education should not have been made without the greatest care being taken, and every possible opinion of value on the points at issue collected.

Now, my Lords, what do the new regulations do to the secondary schools? In this I speak subject to correction, as it is somewhat difficult to arrive at an accurate figure. There are something like 600 secondary schools in the country; and I believe that out of those about 450 will be affected by the new regulations. A large number of those schools owe their existence to the generosity of those who endowed them and others who have helped to maintain them. For many years past these schools have been and are now doing a great and good work, which has always been recognised by the State. The State has been glad to assist and to subsidise these schools; the State has encouraged people to spend money on them, and on account of that encouragement many people have done a great deal to assist the schools in the course of instruction in which they most firmly believe. It has been recognised, very justly no doubt, by the Board of Education that higher grants are necessary for promoting or maintaining the efficiency of these schools. Of that nobody will complain at all. It is absolutely necessary to assist these schools to maintain a high state of efficiency. But are these higher grants to be given for the promotion of efficiency in education and nothing else? I deny it entirely. They are not, at the present moment, proposed to be given for the promotion of efficiency in education. To my mind they are offered on totally different grounds. I believe—and, I think, not unjustly—that they are proposed to be given purely for political purposes.

What are the grounds on which these extra grants will be given? In order to receive an extra grant the school must accept local control, altering entirely its former representation. This alteration is an entire departure from the expert opinion and the opinion of those who have studied the subject in years past. It has always been considered by expert opinion that secondary schools should be carried on, if I may use the expression, in an elastic manner. It has to be remembered that secondary schools are different from elementary schools, for this reason: there is no compulsory attendance, and by giving elasticity to the government of these schools it is made easier for them to meet the requirements which are considered adequate by the parents, and consequently to make the school more attractive to them. This was the line carried out by the Bryce Commission in 1894. This is the principle which underlay the Report of that Commission, and the subsequent development of the secondary school system has been based upon the idea that the State should welcome and encourage every secondary school, no matter how founded or controlled. The scheme adopted by the President of the Board of Education has been brought forward, to my mind, because it will introduce into these schools for the first time an undenominational atmosphere by making the majority of the governors representative. It is a deliberate attack on these schools to make them alter their system of religious education which has been in force up to the present time.

Now, my Lords, let me give an illustration of what I mean—a concrete case showing how a secondary school has been treated by the Board of Education. It is only this morning I had the case put into my hands, though I read a short account of it yesterday in *The Times*. The school to which I refer is the Ranelagh foundation. Lord Ranelagh's school was founded in the 18th century as a school for boys and girls. From time to time regulations have been framed by the Charity Commissioners for the application of the money, but it has always been recognised that the endowment is of an ecclesiastical character. The governors applied a few years ago for a new scheme in order to utilise the endowment for a secondary school which was urgently needed in the locality of East Berkshire. A scheme to enable the capital of the endowment to be utilised in building such a school was sealed on 21st December, 1905, after the present Government had come into power—I ask your Lordships to notice that. A clause in this scheme provided that religious instruction in accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England should be given in the school, subject to a conscience clause. In accordance with the scheme plans have been prepared, which have received the sanction of the Board of Education and the County Council of Berkshire, for the erection of a school, which is now being built; the county council aiding by a grant of £2,000 and the Ranelagh governors contributing £6,000. By the new regulations respecting secondary education no grants will be receivable for the maintenance of this school when completed unless the denominational character is abandoned. It was on the faith of this character being maintained that the governors accepted the scheme of 1905, and unless it had been put into the scheme they would certainly have strenuously and unanimously opposed it. The matter was brought up before the Berkshire Education Committee on Saturday last, and, according to *The Times*, Alderman Ferard said—

> "Then came the new order which swept away the whole understanding between the trustees, the council, and the Board of Education. The result was that the old trustees had been deliberately defrauded of their capital. They hoped when they parted with their funds that there was some reasonable chance of finality, but the result was that an important district around Windsor had been robbed for some political reason. If education was to be conducted with variations from time to time, owing to the political opinions of the Government for the time being, he did not know what was to become of it, for it was of the very essence of educational schemes that there should be finality."

I have ventured to read that extract because I think it is a practical illustration of what is being done at the present time and most undoubtedly will be done in the future.

Another step of a most extraordinary character taken with regard to secondary schools in these new regulations is that where Parliamentary grants are increased only Cowper-Temple teaching is to be given. I think this is a most extraordinary departure. Not only does it show the animus of the Board of Education against denominational teaching, but it is an entirely new departure from the manner in which Parliamentary and local grants have been distributed hitherto. Up till now in the distribution of Parliamentary grants no consideration has ever been given to the question of religious instruction. They have always been given on the ground of efficiency. Now the Board of Education propose to make Parliamentary grants a question of religion. A more dangerous proposal than to bring the religious controversy into this question cannot be imagined. Local grants are now given entirely irrespective of religious considerations. This was a factor very carefully laid down in the Act of 1902, but from that the present Government propose to depart. In Clause 4 of the Act of 1902, it was stated that—

> "A council in the application of money under this part of the Act shall not require that any particular form of religious instruction or worship or any religious catechism or formulary

which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall or shall not be taught, used, or practised in any school, college, or hostel, aided but not provided by the council, and no pupil shall on the ground of religious belief be excluded, etc."

Therefore I ask the noble Earl, on what grounds have His Majesty's Government by their action and their regulations repealed that section which we consider of such importance in the Act of 1902.

Then, my Lords, there is a still further danger with regard to the future of secondary schools. I have heard it rumoured—I have no authority for the statement—that it is quite possible that some local authorities may insist that if secondary schools do not earn the fullest grant obtainable they shall not continue to receive contributions from the local authority. What does that mean? It means that if they are to earn the fullest possible grant they must give up their present system of teaching, and give only Cowper-Temple teaching. I think this is a danger—I do not say it is before us at the present moment; I do not say it is in force; but I like to look at possibilities even more than probabilities—and, that being the case, I think it is well we should have before our minds the danger that may arise of a double penalty being paid by secondary schools, should they refuse to be restricted to Cowper-Temple teaching, and thereby be precluded from receiving the fullest possible grant.

To my mind the position of the Board of Education on this subject of secondary schools is a most remarkable one. The Board of Education at the present moment are the Charity Commissioners, whose duty it is to watch over and preserve the interests of the endowed schools and closely to guard their trusts. That is the duty of the Charity Commissioners who are the Board of Education. But what are the Board of Education doing? They are ignoring their position of trustees as Charity Commissioners, and in their capacity as Board of Education are offering bribes to the secondary schools to break their trusts; they are encouraging them to do so by making the conditions so much easier for them if they do. What would be said of the trustee of any property if he took up this dual position? I had hoped that Lord Barnard, who is an expert in this matter, would have been present to go fully into the question; I merely raise it as one which might escape attention. It may be said that the matter is very simple; that the secondary schools are in a very good position, that they have a way out, that they can contract themselves out by doing certain things. What are those things—

"If as regards the conditions set out in Articles 5, 18 (*b*), 23, and 24 (but not as regards the conditions set out in Article 20) of these regulations, the local education authority pass a resolution informing the Board of Education that the school is in their view required as part of the secondary school provision in their area, and that one or more of these conditions may be waived with advantage in view of the educational needs of the area, the Board of Education may, if they see fit, pay the grants in full under Articles 36 to 41 of this chapter."

What does that mean? It means that there must be a discussion of the individual case before the whole of the council—a discussion which will be not only full, but open to the Press and to everybody to criticise, and it will raise contention in the education body on a subject in regard to which it has never been raised before. I believe there are on these education committees a great many Nonconformists holding views of a fair character who would have no objection whatever to assisting the maintenance of these schools in the condition in which they were, but if their names are to be published and the line they take advertised they will feel that there is a hard and fast line drawn between Nonconformists and denominationalists which has not been drawn before, and the result will be most injurious and unjust to these schools.

Now with regard to the effect of these regulations on training colleges. For the training college, unlike the secondary school, there is no way out whatever —there is no contracting out clause. I am not going to deal with this question at length, because your Lordships will, I hope, have read the great speech delivered on Saturday last by the most rev. Prelate the Archbishop of Canterbury on the occasion of the deputation to the Prime Minister. It would be presumption on my part if, after that speech, I were to attempt to say anything in defence of the training colleges; and I am also in hopes that the most rev. Prelate will himself deal with the subject to-night. Therefore I propose to say only one or two words in regard to the manner in which training colleges are to be treated. I cannot but think that the line taken in the regulations of proposing to fine gentlemen of the calibre and ability of heads of training colleges £100, or to withdraw the grant from them should they not conform entirely to the wishes of the Board of Education, is an insult to those gentlemen. I see that even Mr. McKenna later on seemed to have some hesitation as to whether he had been wise in introducing this paragraph into the regulations.

But there is another point in regard to the training colleges on which I would like to touch. Nonconformists complain that their teachers are handicapped all through their career because they have to forego training and consequently do not command the highest salaries that are obtainable. I have gone into the figures with regard to the numbers of students who attend the various training colleges, and I cannot but think that the complaint of the Nonconformists is not justified. I take the total number of denominational and undenominational residential training colleges, day training colleges, and hostels, and I find that for students who take a two years' course there are vacant each year 2,110 denominational places and 2,581 undenominational places. In addition to this, ten local authorities actually have schemes for the provision of training colleges, all undenominational, and seven other local authorities have the matter under consideration. Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that the complaint of Nonconformists that their teachers have not the same advantages as denominationalists, and that consequently these regulations are necessary in their favour, falls to the ground.

In conclusion, I may say that in these remarks I have endeavoured not to go into detail, but to deal with the question of principle. To my mind the principle running through the action of His Majesty's Government is to endeavour by every possible means in their power to conciliate their extreme Nonconformist supporters, and to wreak vengeance on the Church supporters of denominational religious education because of their refusal to accept the Education Bill of the noble Earl last year. It may be asked why I make such a statement. I cannot forget the threat held out by the noble Earl on the last stage of that Bill in your Lordships' House, when he said—

> "During the coming months a great many harsh things will be said on both sides, and I am afraid some harsh things will be done."

The President of the Board of Education went further, for on the 1st of this month, at Pontypool, he said—

> "The Government went to the House of Lords with a peace-offering in their hands; but the next time they went, it would be with a sword."

We know now what the sword is: it is an endeavour on the part of the Government to crush denominational education under foot, and to hand over religious education entirely to undenominational ideas. We know now exactly what we have to expect. I say that the introduction of these changes in the regulations by the Government to please their Nonconformist supporters is a policy of vindictive spite. That may be said to be a strong expression for a past Minister for Education to use. Gladly would I withdraw and apologise for it if I could receive such a full explanation from the Lord President of the Council as would prove to me that the charge was false. But unless I receive such an explanation, full and complete, I shall adhere to the expression, which I believe will be endorsed not only by every Churchman in the country, but by every fairminded man, no matter to what sect or denomination he may belong.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, the noble Marquess, speaking with all the weight of an ex-President of the Board of Education, has dealt at large with the greater part of the subject now in controversy, and the noble Earl who is now the Lord President must have felt that some at least of the difficulties which have been raised are difficulties which require an answer—that some of these points are very real, and that they press with unexpected harshness and unfairness, possibly through inadvertence, on a great number of those interested in education. I do not propose to follow the noble Marquess into the constitutional questions which he has raised. I shall deal entirely with the second part of the question on the Paper, and especially with that part which relates to training colleges and hostels. The noble Marquess has referred to a speech—if it may be called a speech; it was more or less of a conversational character—which I made on the occasion of a deputation to the Prime Minister on Saturday last. That speech was reproduced at most unexpected length as far as I was concerned, and I hope your Lordships have not done what the noble Marquess trusted you had, namely, read that speech, as I must to some extent traverse the same ground to-day. I am most anxious to avoid in this matter mere technicalities. The subject is a very intricate one; I do not know that I have ever known a question in which it was more difficult to place the issues quite simply and clearly before those who are of necessity unfamiliar with the practical working of our training college system. The details are most important, but I desire as far as possible to leave them on one side, and to deal with one or two large principles which seem to me to underlie some of the proposed changes, and to be eminently worthy of the attention of the House and of the country.

May I first restate in outline some of the facts as to the system of which our training colleges are a part? There are now seventy-four training colleges in England, besides one—a college for the blind—which I need not touch upon; fifty-two of these are residential and twenty-two non-residential. Of the residential colleges, thirty-three belong to the Church of England, seven to the Roman Catholics, two to the Wesleyans, and ten are quite undenominational. The twenty-two non-residential colleges are all undenominational The students in the resident colleges are 5,363, of whom, roughly speaking, 3,300 belong to the Church of England and 1,100 are undenominational. The Church of England has thus about three times as many places in residential colleges as there are undenominational places. There are 269 Wesleyan places and 629 Roman Catholic places. Nearly all the residential colleges were originally provided from voluntary funds, although of course there were considerable building grants in their aid some forty years ago. All the day colleges, I think, are provided from public funds. Without troubling you with more figures, I may say that if your Lordships will add up the details you will find that there are at this moment 2,000 more places in the undenominational colleges, including residential and non-residential, than there are in those which are confined to members of the Church of England. It is well to mention that fact, because people sometimes speak as though there were no openings now for undenominationalists in the training colleges of the country.

Now, my Lords, who go to these training colleges, and how do they qualify to get there? Until a few years ago nearly all those who applied for admission to our training colleges had been pupil-teachers, having gone through the ordinary course of four or five years training, and, having finished that course, were qualified to sit for what was then known as the King's Scholarship examination. They were arranged in order of merit and in classes when the examination lists were published, and from them the selection was made of those who were to go into the training colleges. But now the position has become much more complicated, because, most rightly and properly, in recent years men and women have been allowed to qualify for admission to training colleges by many other processes than passing through the stage of pupil-teachership; they may, for instance, matriculate at London University or pass the Oxford or Cambridge higher local examinations. The conditions which must be satisfied by candidates are set out in these Regulations, and it will be seen how varied they are, and how extraordinarily difficult it is to choose from among the applicants those who ought to be admitted, to decide between the relative merits of those who have qualified in different ways—for instance, between those who have matriculated and those who have passed through the pupil-teacher system—and to place them in order of merit. A large power of choice must necessarily rest somewhere, if persons qualified in such a variety of ways are ultimately to be selected to be placed in the colleges to which they aspire to enter. The rule hitherto has been that among those thus qualified the training college authorities have had to make a choice, and in making it they have, as far as I know, always tried to look to the general fitness of each man or woman to receive the full good which the college offers, both in secular and in religious matters ; they have had to consider all the facts belonging to the training and life of the particular candidates, and to judge which would be best fitted to become really competent teachers at the end of two or three years training in the college. Until recently they were very greatly helped in doing that ; indeed, half the work was done for them by the class list, which showed what the position was of the various candidates. But recently that has been entirely abolished, and the whole list of names—some 10,000 in the women's department—is now published alphabetically, without any order. Anyone who will consider what that must mean in the endeavour to make a selection by rule of thumb out of the candidates who may apply, in the order of their application, will see that it is practically an impossible task. There is a hint given in these regulations that some change may be necessary in the mode of making the results of that examination public, in order to facilitate the ultimate choice for entrance to the training colleges. That is a mere hint, not a promise, and at this moment the list is literally such that the persons who have to make a choice in regard to particular applicants have to grope their way without any guidance. When it was announced a little while ago that a change was to take place the training college authorities were warned that the list would be published without the classes, and told that this would throw on them a greater responsibility in the way of finding out for themselves the relative merits of applicants. That happened, I think, eighteen months ago, and the training college authorities are perfectly ready to accept that responsibility, and to make their choice, with the additional help of examination or otherwise. I should add that in the colleges belonging to the Church of England the accepted applicants must be mainly—not entirely, because there is at least one exception, and there may be more—members of the Church of England. There, of course, lies a large part of the gravamen in regard to these changes, and on that a great deal necessarily turns.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

Then, my Lords, I must ask your attention to another point, which is really a vital one as regards the question of fairness or unfairness. During the last few years a new development has taken place. We were asked informally whether our training colleges would be prepared to admit students from outside who need not be members of the Church of England, and who might take advantage of everything the college offers, except the religious side, which they did not want. That is to say, they might be resident in a hostel or other establishment outside our training college and come to it day by day and take all its advantages, social, recreative, or educational, with the one exception of the religious side, which they did not want. I was able a year ago to inform the President of the Board of Education that all our colleges were prepared—not at once, for it would take a little time to make such arrangements—so far as it was locally and topographically possible—to enlarge their buildings adequately to receive students who should thus come into them. We set to work to do that and have spent money in doing it. We have been preparing our colleges for those who would come in from outside, and to meet, as I think, the difficulty which the Nonconformists feel by giving them in the residential training colleges all the advantages the colleges offer except the religious instruction. We intend to do that ; of course it has not been done to any great extent yet, we are waiting for the influx. It will take a little time to arrange about the change in our buildings, and large sums have been expended in the endeavour to do it. About ten years ago a great college was founded in South London, St. Gabriel's, Kennington ; there it was arranged with the Board of Education from the first that half the students should belong to the category I have described, those living outside coming in for everything except the religious teaching and worship. The whole college has been started, and built at a cost of £60,000, on those lines, and the whole of the arrangements have been calculated on the theory that that will be continued. That is an extremely important element in regard to the allegation we make that what is now proposed will press upon us with undue harshness. But look at it quite apart from how it presses on us. Remember that every one of those places thus acquired for non-Church people within our walls would have been new and would make some addition to the present deficient supply of training college places, whereas, as the regulations are now drawn, there is no addition whatever made to the number of places for students; there is merely a shifting of the grievance, if there be a grievance, from one set of shoulders to another. Not a single additional place is provided by the regulations laid down. And moreover, all those new places connected with our colleges would have been undenominational.

Now, my Lords, coming to the new rules published a few days ago, I will state their purport, leaving details aside, not because they are unimportant, not because I am unfamiliar with them, but because I want to state the case in the most general way. For the colleges now in existence the rules and management are allowed to remain as before —denominational in character as regards authorities, teachers, chapel services, and the rest. But the following new restrictions are laid down:—In entering a college no religious question is allowed to be raised as regards the candidate coming in, and anybody may come in, be his or her attitude towards religious life what it may. In the second place, there is to be no consideration of what are called "social antecedents or the like." Now, my Lords, although I have had the benefit of the kind endeavours of the President of the Board of Education and the Prime Minister, upon whom we waited the other day, I still find the greatest difficulty in knowing how, if I were the principal of a training college and had to make the choice, I should know what is meant by "social antecedents and the like." A great many of us have been trying for some time past to make our training college work such as to facilitate the entrance of those whose general knowledge apart from the mere examination was of a higher kind than was customary before. We have tried to get those who come from the more cultured surroundings, surroundings which have enabled them from childhood onwards to have a larger knowledge of the facts of life and education in all its different branches, so that they are better fitted to exercise that kind of influence which we want exercised upon the little children in our schools than would be even some of the cleverest and best if they came from a different atmosphere and had not had these advantages. Do not suppose for a moment that I or anyone on whose behalf I speak desire to make it difficult for the clever and capable child from the humblest ranks of society who is able to rise to the dignity and splendid position of a teacher by sheer force of character and merit. We shall always find places for those; we welcome them and regard them as some of the best ingredients we could possibly have, but at the same time we do not want rules laid down for the guidance of those who have to make the selection which will force them to exclude altogether any consideration of the more general attributes, powers, and attainments of the candidates apart from the mere examination test. But that is one of the rules here laid down—that there shall be "no consideration of social antecedents and the like." I hope we shall hear from the Government to-night that it is to be so interpreted that we are not to rule out altogether these considerations.

Then we are told that no examination of any sort or kind, written or oral, may be imposed by the authorities of a college in order to test the relative merits of those who have passed the qualifying examination. There is a hint that we are to have the aid for the future of a classified list as formerly instead of a non-classified list as at present of those who have passed the usual examination. But we have still the difficulty that the authorities of the training colleges will have to form an estimate of the relative attainments of people trained in totally different surroundings, by totally different processes, and arriving at the ultimate goal—the presentation of their credentials such as they are. Without the power of applying some test as to their relative merits, how can anyone say which of two men or two women would be the better?

Then we are told that great attention is to be paid to the order of the applications as they come in. If it is to be a mere question of rule of thumb as to the order in which applications come in, your Lordships can at once see what the difficulties will be. Another new rule is that all information as to the qualifications of candidates which has been received by the college authorities, either prior or subsequent to the application, must be forthcoming to the Board of Education. Are those words to be taken literally? The head of a training college is generally an educationist in touch with a number of other educationists, and receiving private information, exactly as the head of a college receives information as to candidates who may be coming up to matriculate at Oxford or Cambridge. If these words mean that the ultimate rejection of a candidate must not turn upon information which cannot be produced, I can perfectly understand the rule, and would not be prepared to dispute it; but if it means that any letter or message or any information of any sort or kind which reaches the college authorities, either directly or indirectly, respecting a candidate, must be handed over or made or produced to the Board of Education, then it is one of the most perplexing directions ever given to a person who is in the habit of receiving confidential and private as well as public communications in such matters.

Then, we are told that, should the head of the college, in making his or her choice, unfortunately make a mistake, and should the grounds upon which a candidate has been rejected be, in the view of the Board of Education, unreasonable—

"the college or hostel concerned will be liable to a reduction of its total grant for the year, not exceeding £100 on the first occasion, and to its removal from the list of recognised colleges receiving grants on a second occasion."

["Shame!"] I say without fear of contradiction that no rule ought to have been so worded for application to people of the highest culture and attainments who are giving their lives to this work. At all events, if it be really necessary to prescribe financial penalties, the rule might have been worded in a somewhat different tone.

I have endeavoured to avoid technicalities, but I think your Lordships will have seen how exteremely difficult will be the task imposed upon the training college authorities in making choice amongst the candidates. What I wish to contend is this—and I say it with the deepest seriousness and with a full sense of responsibility—that these changes, if carried out as they stand, would gravely imperil the religious character of the elementary education throughout the country; and further, that they would imperil our educational life and progress in the schools by lowering the probable type of teacher whom we are likely ultimately to obtain. Feeling that, I am bound to warn the House of Lords, and, so far as one's voice extends, to warn the country, of a peril, which is not a question of denomination, but which concerns all those who have at heart the religious life of England, and who care about educational progress in our elementary schools.

I will give my reasons for those two contentions to which I attach such importance. We have heard again and again—and I have always been thankful for the assurances we have had from the Government—that our schools are to remain schools in which a religious education may be given, and that the secular system has not been adopted—that it has been, as one member of the Government said, smashed. The secular system has been rejected by the Government deliberately, and our elementary schools are to retain a religious character. But on whom is it to depend whether or not that religious character is given? On whom is instruction in the Bible, putting aside for the moment the denominational question, to depend? It must rest upon the teachers who are to be put into the schools. Who are these teachers going to be? They must be those who come out of our training colleges. Once let a training college cease to have a religious character impressed upon it, and cease to give within its walls the training in that most difficult art of all—the imparting of religious knowledge to little children—how can you maintain that religious character in your schools which in all your educational projects you rightly—and I am thankful for it—boast that you have maintained. It cannot be denied that with the increase of day training colleges there will be an increase of places in which it is practically impossible that religious education can be given, or, to say the least, in which it is exceedingly unlikely that religious education with any definiteness at all will be given. As a matter of fact, in the day training colleges now being established by county councils there is no religious training at all; they are, I think, largely of necessity, secular training places pure and simple. If you are going to prevent throughout England the security of the existence of a certain number of training colleges in which from beginning to end there will be a religious basis to the education given, and if you further prevent religious hostels being attached to undenominational colleges, then you are taking away just that security which was offered by these means against the purely secular training which would otherwise be prevalent throughout our training colleges.

I certainly understood that we were encouraged to establish these hostels, and I was not surprised, because I recognise to the full the difficulty there must be in the Government's—either through the Board of Education at the centre or through the local authorities throughout the land—undertaking the extraneous task of training teachers to give religious instruction. When we offered to put down hostels of a religious kind which should be boarding houses in connection with undenominational training colleges, when we offered to look after the religious life of their inmates, and see that those who came into them were those who wanted to profit by the religious opportunities provided, then not merely were we helping the teachers themselves, but we were doing the very thing which the Government ought specially to thank us for doing. We offered to do something which could be done by voluntary effort but which cannot be done so well by any State authority, and now we are told that all these denominational hostels which we desired to establish around the undenominational training colleges are to be forbidden. Those which have been established are to be allowed in a sense to go on, but their doors are to be open to everybody, and there will be no reason why the inmates should care the least about the religious teaching offered, while for the future we are not to be allowed to found any such places at all. We shall doubtless be told by the noble Earl that we may not call them hostels, but that we may call them lodgings. If your Lordships will look at the rules in detail you will find that whereas the inmates of hostels are to be allowed to have a certain sum paid for them by grant to the hostel, those who are in lodgings are to be allowed a much smaller sum. The difference is £15 between the sum paid for a man in a hostel and the sum paid for a man in a lodging. Why is every man who comes into the place which has a religious stamp upon it to be fined that £15? It may sound a very small matter to those who are dealing with huge sums at the centre. But our plan is that each of these hostels should give accommodation for thirty candidates — that is to say, we shall have to pay an additional £450 a year for each such hostel because we are doing something which, instead of being censured, ought to be received with gratitude —because it is the very thing which the Government find it difficult to do for themselves, and have to look to voluntary bodies to do for them. But, instead of being encouraged, we are being hampered and set back by the manner in which difficulties are placed in our way. I do not honestly believe that the country wants that at all; I do not believe they want these hostels to be made so expensive that we shall practically be unable to go forward with the work for which they were intended. So much for what I have contended, that these regulations, if they are passed, will impair the religious character of our elementary education.

Now I pass from the religious side of the Regulations altogether, to their effect upon educational efficiency. Is it really to be the case that we are to act virtually by rule of thumb, or by chance, with regard to the candidates whom we are to choose to go into the training college and get the coping-stone set upon the education that they have had in the schools or in their preparation for matriculation? I honestly do not see at present how any other method can be followed than that which will virtually be the order of application, which is more or less a matter of chance. That method will cripple immensely the power of the authorities of the training colleges to judge whether or not a man or woman who offers himself or herself is qualified to get the full advantage of the college. We heard a great deal last year, and I agree with it to the the full, about everything depending upon personality of the teacher. That personality is not a thing that begins at twenty-five; it begins much earlier than that, and it is a thing which the skilled judgment of the authorities is able to test and understand when candidates come forward. Are we to be debarred from looking at that question of personality, or from considering whether or not he or she seems to be the kind of person who will make the sort of teacher the country really wants? We are to be debarred from doing that, because we are not to be allowed to make any choice except in accordance with the order of delivery of applications in the post. I do not believe that a rule of thumb of that kind will ever select the kind of teachers required by the authorities, or by the country.

It has been said, and I have no doubt we shall be told again, that, after all, we must remember that we are dealing with public money. "There is the real difficulty," we shall be told, "of the whole question. It is not as if it was a question of private money; you are dealing with public money and practically nothing else." It is not fair, because the actual maintenance of the college work day by day is largely mainly met from public sources, to forget the enormous expenditure which we have been voluntarily put to in providing these colleges to do the work which you are now going to impair or even prohibit. There was a letter the other day in *The Times* from no less a person than Dr. Macnamara, who, if anybody in England does, really understands this subject. He called attention to the fact that our colleges had received grants sixty or seventy years ago towards their building, and that we always ought to remember that that grant gave the public a great right over them; but the fact that we had built up the rest of the building, beyond the Government grant—which, after all, was even then less than one-third of the whole—a long time ago could not be allowed now to give us any claim for particular rights in this matter. Here are his words—

"Is the proposition, then, this, that because the Church partly built these colleges fifty or sixty years ago it is for ever to put a ringed fence round places now, at any rate, and for a long time past almost entirely maintained from Government grants and students' fees?"

To an expert the deceptiveness of that sentence lurks in the word "maintained." It is true that as regards the maintenance of the college day by day the Government grant goes far to do it. But has Dr. Macnamara not forgotten—I will not say he is ignorant, it would be insulting—has he not accidentally omitted to state that, in addition to our expenditure of sixty or seventy years ago, a similar expenditure is still going on, and that the cost has been enormous down to the present time? Take the college of St. Gabriel, Kennington. Sixty thousand pounds was spent a few years ago in founding that college, and we have been enlarging many of our colleges even more recently. Within the last few months one of these hostels has been finished by the National Society. It cost between £5,000 and £6,000. It was built to take in denominational students who are attending a day training college close by. It is placed near other hostels, built by the County Councils of Kent and Surrey, which are quite undenominational, and in regard to entrance it will henceforth stand in exactly the same position. Does anyone suppose that we should have spent £5,000 or £6,000 to put a hostel there unless we thought it would have this character and that we should be able to ask applicants for admission whether they cared to profit by the religious training we offered, as well as the secular training? I am not able to give the complete sum of our recent expenditure, but I have some figures for the last twelve years, and there is no difficulty in arriving at something like £250,000 which we have spent purely voluntarily during these years on the part of the Church of England alone, for setting forward this particular cause. Are we, then, to be told by a gentleman whose name as an expert carries weight throughout the country that, although fifty or sixty years ago we bore more than two-thirds of the cost of building these colleges, and although we have kept up the buildings and rebuilt them, and have been spending during the last few years very large sums, you are now bound to debar us from doing this work? At the very least I can give an account showing that in the last twelve years we have spent £210,000 for setting forward this kind of education, which will now be made ten times more difficult than before. This is not a mere question of money. We spent the money gladly, and we would do so again, but why did we spend it? We spent in order that the religious side should be secure. You find great difficulty, and you will find increasing difficulty, in the new day colleges in giving religious training. We spent that money in order that we might be able to do that which you would have found it difficult to get done without our voluntary effort. We paid that money to secure the inmates who would make the best use for the common good of the opportunity which the residential college affords.

Now, my Lords, why was it that these regulations were so suddenly sprung upon us at such brief notice? A fortnight ago, when our colleges had broken up or were breaking up, and the principals were going or had gone abroad, when it was impossible to summon the college council, these regulations were issued, and to some extent they come into operation on 1st August next—that is next week. Was there any reason in the nature of things why we should not have had a few months notice that this was going to be done? Is there any reason now why the operation of these regulations should not be postponed? It may be said, "You have not got to do anything very practical on 1st August next." But I have been in daily intercourse with principals of our colleges, and I find they are in a condition of utter perplexity as to what, practically, they are to do. I was present yesterday at a long meeting of all the principals of training colleges who could be got together at such short notice and in such circumstances, and I was struck by their loyalty to the public good, by their anxiety for educational progress, and by the way in which they subordinated all petty considerations to the principles of educational progress, secular and religious. They, one after another, told us of the great difficulty they had of knowing what to do with these regulations, which come into operation to a certain extent next week. There is, naturally, in their minds for the reasons I have stated, an intense depression as to the educational outlook, even apart from its religious side, but they care intensely, primarily perhaps, for the religious side, in the large sense of the term, and they are tempted to say there is something very like a breach of faith, when, having, in response to the encouragement given, extended our colleges in order that these people outside might come in, we find that the hostel will not be differentiated in any way from the college itself. They feel it still more as a hardship with regard to our denominational hostels in connection with secular colleges. They feel it on educational grounds, because it will be practically impossible on the lines now suggested to secure those best qualified to take advantage of the training the college offers. As a mere matter of administration, they are indeed nonplussed. There is the whole question of trust deeds. I am not prepared to say what exactly is the effect of each trust deed upon this particular question. It may turn out that some of our trust deeds will not be violated by carrying out these regulations. But we think there are trust deeds that will be violated by what it is proposed to do. What are the principals to do when the applications begin to come in? Are they to consider this question as a practical one? Are they merely to return an answer that it is impossible to give any reply at all? Is it possible to consider these trust deeds before 1st August? Why were we not given a few months notice in order that we could understand what we were to do?

But I pass from this minor matter to the bigger question. Mr. McKenna told us the other day that all these regulations obliged us to do was to buy a register. I was sorry for that expression, because it seemed to miss the real feeling which is at the bottom of this matter. These people cannot be guided by what they set down in a register, they must be guided by the principles they were set there to promote, to get the men and women best qualified to take advantage of the college. The inconsiderateness of the whole *modus operandi* is one of the worst symptoms of the spirit which would seem to lie behind it. Do not let it be said we are against the new regulations as a whole, either as regards training colleges or secondary schools. I could easily point out some which seem to me to be a great gain. I am one of those who are for progress in educational matters all along the line. Wherever the regulations give us help towards educational progress, towards making our educational system extend wider and deeper into our common life, I am thankful for that help. Wherever they promote educational gain, these reguations will be welcome, but we feel that the new departure, both as regards secondary schools and as regards training colleges, is not educationally helpful, either secularly or on the religious side. The administrators are discouraged and depressed in what they do, the educationists—not the denominationalists alone—are everywhere puzzled. I think it is an open secret that the county councils are already finding themselves in the greatest difficulty as to how they are to work the new regulations. Is there to be any local choice allowed as regards the applicants? Is a county council which has a training college in Essex or Sussex to be obliged to accept candidates from Yorkshire, or, if in other respects they are of equal merit, are they merely to take the candidate whose letter arrives first by the post, showing no preference to candidates for their own county? It is quite possible that that kind of difficulty might be overcome, but we ought to have had time to do it. But we have not been allowed time and the whole thing has been sprung upon us in such a way as to render it intolerably difficult to make it work. If, in face of all that, we were to be silent now, we should be told afterwards, why did you not speak out at the time? Therefore, we protest now against that anti-religious trend—I fear I must use the phrase—which extends throughout the regulations both in regard to the colleges themselves and to the hostels and against the disastrous educational result which we believe must follow. I believe, with regard to the religious side, we should have with us, if this thing were only better understood, a vast number of the keenest and warmest-hearted of our Nonconformist brethen. What you are damaging is not so much denominationalism as religion. It is the religious side which we have all been thankful to feel was going to be preserved in our schools, which it will be impossible to preserve adequately if these regulations are maintained in the form in which they now stand, and we believe that the protest that we make against some of them will have a wide and far-reaching echo amongst the English people generally.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, His Majesty's Government have certainly no complaint to make of the fact that this debate has been initiated by the questions of the noble Marquess opposite. On the contrary, feeling, as we do, that the general effect of these regulations has been, to some extent misunderstood, and, to some extent, exaggerated—and I am bound to say that in the speech of the noble Marquess it was impossible to avoid noting signs of the latter defect—we are very glad that the matter should be fully discussed in your Lordships' House. I am quite certain we all, on whichever side of the House we sit, admire not only the singularly lucid manner in which the most rev. Primate stated all the facts of the case, but also the general moderation which characterised his remarks.

I desire first to deal with the question of the noble Marquess as to the £100,000 grant. I think the noble Marquess first asked me what were the conditions, and what was the manner in which that grant would be distributed. In the first place this grant of £100,000 will only be payable, perhaps almost as a matter of course, to local authorities who desire to erect schools. In the second place, it will only be payable in cases where the Board of Education have completely satisfied themselves that the proposed new school is needed to meet the existing demand; that is to say, that where the ordinary duty falls on the local authority of supplying a school as, for instance, in some cases where there is a numerical deficiency the Board of Education would not think proper to allocate any part of this £100,000 for that purpose: that is to say, it must be proved that this school is needed over and above the ordinary numerical sufficiency of places in order to meet the very special state of things which I need not now describe, because the condition of affairs in certain districts was so fully gone into by the House during the Education Bill discussion of last year.

I may remind your Lordships that the period during which this money will be available for expenditure will be a very short one. The money will only be payable up to 31st March next and it will not be payable yet, because three months notice from the time of the passing of the Appropriation Bill of this year will be required under the existing Education Acts. Therefore your Lordships will see clearly that the time during which this particular sum of £100,000, or any part of it, can be spent, is not long. The noble Marquess then went on to speak of the general principle involved, and he asked the question whether the Board of Education have any legal power to distribute to local authorities any part of this £100,000. The legal position was, I think, very fairly stated by Mr. Speaker in another place, when the matter was raised there as regards the competence of the House of Commons to deal with the matter in this particular way.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: He said the House of Commons could break the law, I think.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I do not remember whether Mr. Speaker used that particular phrase. The view which is taken by His Majesty's Government and I assume would be taken by others outside, of the transaction is simply this. A certain sum is placed in the Estimates, but, of course, does not become available until an Act of Parliament is passed. The effect of that Act of Parliament is to suspend during one year a certain section of an existing Act of Parliament—Section 96 of the Act of 1870. That may or may not be a desirable proceeding, and upon that, of course, difference of opinion is perfectly legitimate. I do not profess to speak as a lawyer, but, speaking as a Member of one of the Houses of Parliament, I do not see anything strange or unconstitutional in passing a second Act of Parliament which repeals the provisions of a former Act. As we all know, the thing is continually done. The peculiar thing in this case is that the annulling is only temporary, but in other respects it is exactly on all fours with what is done in every session —that is to say, annulling the provisions of former Acts by passing a new one. I have no doubt that my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack will respond to the appeal which was made to him by the noble Marquess, and state his opinion on the purely legal aspect of the case. Of course, as I have said, the propriety of what everybody admits is an unusual proceeding is and must be a pure matter of opinion. We admit that the proceeding is unusual, but we also maintain that the circumstances are of such a character, and the urgency of the case is sufficiently great to warrant a departure from the usual proceeding. The noble Marquess asked why we did not proceed by Bill. Perhaps if we could have had an assurance from noble Lords opposite that such a Bill would have passed we might have taken that course, but we shall await any such assurance before admitting that we are in any sense wrong in taking the course that we have taken.

The most rev. Primate dealt very fully and in a most instructive manner with the whole question of training colleges. I should like to say one word upon a matter which he mentioned, and which has also been mentioned very often in this and in similar connections, as to the claim made by those who have either entirely or in part erected buildings for certain denominational purposes, to retain the perpetual management of the institutions carried on in those buildings. We are told that buildings of this kind were erected on the faith that the kind of teaching that existed in them would be allowed to go on permanently, and that they were encouraged by Government grants. That, if you come to think of it, lands you in a singular paradox, because I suppose the greater the grant the greater the encouragement; and you find yourself at last in this position that a building almost entirely erected by the Government grant receives so much encouragement that it ought to remain permanently denominational.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: Is it I who am supposed to have said that?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Oh, certainly not. But I said it is a paradox into which the people who hold that view might easily find themselves landed. The fact is that the argument is precisely that with which we are so familiar in the case of the elementary schools. Certain people, at some time or another, erected buildings for a particular purpose. They have, in some cases, added to and repaired them. In consequence, however large the share of public money which is applied now to the maintenance—and, of course, an increasing share has been in almost all cases so applied—however great that share, the purely denominational character of the training college, or school, or whatever it may be is to remain until the world's end. That is an issue on which, I admit, we are sharply divided, and it is one on which I am afraid, from all my experience in the past, we are not likely to arrive at any agreement. The main grievance, in the case of training colleges, arises out of the application of the Conscience Clause to them. Here, again, we are sharply divided. Noble Lords will certainly not convince us, and, I am afraid we are not likely to convince them. The fact, which we hold to be a fact, that the application of large sums of public money compels the application of a conscience clause, and that by supplying the money the State is entitled to impose a conscience clause as a condition, is one to which we most strongly hold; but it is one which, as I have said, I am afraid noble Lords opposite will not be disposed to admit. Then the noble Marquess complained that, whereas neutrality had reigned in the past in these cases, we have introduced religious strife, both in the training colleges and in the secondary schools. It is easy enough to avoid religious strife if you give the preference which noble Lords would like to give to any one particular denomination. You avoid religious strife if you limit your school or college to people of one denomination, on the principle of the Spanish Minister, who, when asked on his deathbed if he desired to forgive his enemies, replied that he had none, as he had shot them all. If you have no boy or girl or no student who differs from the religious views of the school or training college, it is perfectly obvious that you do avoid religious strife, but, as we think, at a very great cost.

The grievance with regard to training colleges consists, in the first place, in what the most rev. Primate would consider the enforced admission of outsiders. That is, I know, an objection which is held, if possible, more strongly by those who are entitled to speak for the Roman Catholic Church. I had the honour this morning of being present at a deputation at which the noble Duke opposite, the Duke of Norfolk, was also present in the company of those best entitled to speak for the Roman Catholic community in England, and, from what they said, it is quite evident that they do regard the introduction into the training colleges of those who do not hold their faith as a very serious matter.

It has been suggested that, after 1st August, the denominational training colleges might be flooded by applications from all parts of England, and that serious inconvenience and great difficulty might be caused in dealing with a large number of applicants as to whom nothing was known. My right hon. friend has recognised that difficulty, and he proposes that every student who applies for admission to a training college should accompany that application with the payment of a small fee—I think 10s. was the sum which he suggested as reasonable. That fee could be returned if the applicant entered the college, but, in other cases, the college would retain it. The effect of that, as your Lordships will see, would be to prevent an applicant from sowing letters broadcast to a great number of colleges in the hope of being taken in at one.

We do not for a moment believe that the consequence of these regulations will be to flood denominational colleges with students who desire to exercise the conscience clause. In the first place, as regards the case of those who might go to a denominational college with a directly hostile intention, which has been suggested as a possibility, it would, in our opinion, very easily be dealt with, because it would not be a case of religious distinction, but such a person could always be excluded—excluded beforehand, if his intentions were known—excluded, after he is there, if his action proved his sentiments, simply and solely on grounds of discipline. He would not be turned out merely because he is a Nonconformist or Agnostic, but because he was an aggressive person whose action was destructive of the discipline of the college.

In fact, it certainly seems to me that, where students of another faith enter a residential donominational college, the prospect will be infinitely more in the direction of the college being likely to convert them than of their in any way damaging the college. Everybody admits, I think, the great charm of the religious teaching, enforced, as it is, by the high character of those who give it, which obtains in denominational colleges, and I think it exceedingly likely that the student who had gone there belonging to a different faith, and, possibly, with a prejudice against the faith of the college, might find his prejudices melt away, and, before his or her course was over, would be admitted into the faith of the religious body to whom the college belonged.

The noble Marquess Lord Londonderry spoke in somewhat hard terms of what he described as the fining of denominational colleges which declined to exercise the conscience clause. The most rev. Primate did not go so far. He objected rather to the tone than to the substance of the regulations. The noble Marquess, having himself been at the Board of Education must know, and I am astonished at his forgetfulness in not noting, that to diminish the grant where a college or school declines to enforce the conscience clause is simply what has always been done under the Act of 1870 and under the Act of 1902. It is, in fact, the sole weapon which the Board of Education has at its command, and all that this regulation does is instead of doing what would be done in the case of an elementary school, which might be immediately struck off the grant-receiving list, to warn the college in the first place by a fine, which is not to exceed the sum named in the regulations, and, then, on the second occasion, if the college offends again, to strike it off the grant-receiving list.

Then the most rev. Primate dealt with the question of hostels. Like him, I am very anxious not to wade through a number of technical details to the weariness of your Lordships, but I do just wish to say a word on the regulation which he mentioned—No. 57, I think it is, in the Training College Regulations—which allows hostels which are to be treated as lodgings to receive the lower scale of grants. The most rev. Primate stated that in the case of men this would mean to them a difference of £15. The most rev. Primate is taking part in a debate, and is, therefore, of course, entitled to put his case in its strongest form, but he did not mention that, in the case of women, the difference is only £5, and I believe it to be the fact that a great many more women teachers are, and will be, inmates of these hostels than men.

Then on the question of social antecedents, the most rev. Primate very frankly expressed a desire—I hope I am not misrepresenting him—to be able to some extent to choose for the training colleges those who had had opportunities of acquiring a somewhat wider culture than would be possible for those with a certain kind of social antecedents. If it was a case of leaving it to the most rev. Primate, we should all be glad, I am sure, to trust his acumen and conscientiousness in such a case, but I confess that, applied by ordinary people, it does seem to me to be a somewhat dangerous practice. It does open the door to what one can only call a certain amount of social snobbery. I know, of course, that the most rev. Primate stated, and stated what everybody would have expected, that he for one would not place the slightest bar in the way of the intelligent poor child who, to his or her credit, had risen to the possibility of entering such a college. Yet, as I say, I am not quite so certain that all people who might be concerned in the matter would hold that view with entirely the same strength, or that they could be entrusted to exercise a perfectly sound and fair discretion in the matter.

The most rev. Primate also complained that these regulations had been suddenly sprung on the training colleges. I will admit that at first sight it does look as though little time were given for preparation, but my right hon. friend, in saying what he did about the register, did so, I am certain, simply and solely with the idea of reassuring the most rev. Primate and those on whose behalf he speaks, and it was very far indeed from his mind to subject them to any undue amount of haste in this matter. It is my right hon. friend's opinion, on the best advice he can get, that when the time really comes, the difficulties will not be found nearly so great as is anticipated. We are familiar with the sort of panic —not always quite of a reasonable character—which sometimes overtakes those responsible for the management of an institution when any change is threatened. I hope that the difficulties referred to by the most rev. Primate will prove to be far less serious than he anticipates.

One word with regard to the position of secondary schools. I am very glad, that so far no complaints have been made with regard to the provision of free places. The regulation states that 25 per cent. of free places should be given in schools receiving the grant, but it adds that that proportion may be reduced in particular places. I think it is a wise discretion, and one which ought to relieve the anxiety of some schools which have been concerned as to the possibility of their providing the full number of free places. It must be remembered, also, that these free places have only to be offered; they have not to be kept empty. If it is found, as it undoubtedly will be in some districts, that the full proportion of the free places are not being filled, then they may be filled up in the ordinary way. As regards the provision of schools, the noble Marquess admitted that the regulations were not quite so stringent as might be inferred, because all the conditions which affect religious teaching, although not those which affect free places, may be waived if the local authorities agree. Our hope is that that regulation will meet all the hardest cases.

There are, of course, a certain number of very valuable schools which are unable or unwilling to come under the regulations requiring full public control. There are others which cannot entirely divest themselves of their denominational character, or even to the extent required by the regulations. In those cases it is practically certain that the local authorities, knowing the good work they have done, will consent to waive the regulations, and consequently the very far-reaching effects which the noble Marquess thought would follow for those schools will be averted. The noble Marquess said that the denominational character of the schools would have to be abandoned. That is, surely, a considerable over-statement. First, there is this power of waiver, and then the kind of regulations which are applied to the elementary schools do not apply to these schools in important points affecting the denominational character. It is not unfair to say that the general effect of the application of these provisions will be to make these secondary schools rather nearer in character to the great public schools in which so many of your Lordships have been educated. They, as we know, are almost exclusively undenominational in character.

I should like to say in conclusion, that I do not think it is quite fair of the most rev. Primate to describe these regulations as being anti-religious. They are certainly not so in intention, and, as we think, not in effect. I can only say that His Majesty's Government have no desire or intention to imperil religious teaching, nor, as far as it is consistent with their views of what is demanded by the fact that these institutions are so largely supported by public money, to interfere with their religious character. It is perfectly true that His Majesty's Government rejected a secular system as applicable to elementary schools; and they did so in the belief that the country rejected it also. Both the noble Marquesses on the Front Bench opposite (The Marquess of Londonderry and the Marquess of Salisbury) cheer. I believe that that is the case; but whether it will always be the case is another matter. If the country wants a secular system, the individuals who compose His Majesty's present Administration may or may not grant it.

But if not it will be easy for the country to put other people in their place who will. I only say that because I feel strongly that if it is attempted, either in relation to elementary or secondary education, to insist too strongly on denominational needs, or even to press too hardly what may be considered the just claims of denominationalism for consideration, the time may come when those who, like myself, do not desire to see a secular system may be powerless to prevent it—a circumstance which, I believe, the whole of your Lordships' House would sincerely deplore.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: My Lords, the most rev. Primate complained that those connected with training colleges had not had time enough given to them to prepare the action which they might think necessary to take in regard to these regulations. After listening to the speech of the noble Earl the Lord President it is evident that the Government have not given themselves time to prepare any defence for these extraordinary regulations. The groping perplexity with which we have approached this question has not been repudiated, but I venture to think is evidently fully shared by the noble Earl. In reply to the noble Marquess Lord Londonderry the Lord President said it was unfair to state that these regulations were introducing religious strife into training college administration and secondary education, and he said it was always very easy to avoid religious strife if those who might be expected to indulge in it were given all they wanted and were amply supported by public funds.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: That is not what I said. I said it was very easy to avoid religious strife in any institution if you ensured that all those who studied in the institution were of the same religious faith.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: I am glad to hear the noble Earl admit that if a training college is confined to one religion, strife will be eliminated from that institution. I venture to think that precisely what these regulations do is to bring about religious strife. Indeed, they have already done so. Hitherto these training colleges have been provided almost entirely out of the funds of those bodies who are zealous for religious education. Those who have failed to make these sacrifices are now not only to have training colleges provided for them by the State, but are to have the doors of other people's colleges opened to them. That is what we feel to be a very great grievance. A letter by Dr. Macnamara has been read suggesting that, after all, the foundation of these colleges was no very heavy drain on voluntary sources, and that from that date forward they have been maintained from public funds.

As regards our own training colleges, I cannot state the full amount we have spent upon them. But in the case of one college alone, in Liverpool, £69,000 of voluntary contributions has been expended, and within I think the last four or five years £30,000 has been expended on the purchase of site and buildings for another, and £5,000 has been laid out upon it to make it more suitable for the requirements. In the last few years we have founded four or five training colleges, and throughout all those efforts a sum which, I believe, at the utmost amounts to £6,000 is the only help we have had from public funds. Moreover, as regards the maintenance and upkeep of these colleges we have ourselves found year by year an average of over 20 per cent. of the cost. That, I may say, without wishing in any way to blow our own trumpet, is considerably higher than the percentage found by any other body. While we spend 20 per cent. on maintenance and upkeep, those who desire what is commonly called Cowper-Temple religion, that religion which I maintain His Majesty's Government is now about to put upon a specially favoured basis at the cost of other religious denominations, expend only ·6 per cent., which is a very distinct difference.

We are sometimes told that we must not regard financial help as encouragement, but we have in many ways had great encouragement in our endeavour to carry on a great and important part of the educational work of the country. I admit it with gratitude; I claim it as a justification for what we have done, and for what we have a right to expect. We understand that those who maintain the charms and advantages of Cowper-Templeism are now to have colleges provided for them. I am very glad indeed to hear it; it is high time that was done. We have been making this provision all these years and they have not been doing so, but now it is going to be done for them out of the public moneys to which we ourselves contribute. We make no grievance of that. Let it be done by all means; let those who have not in the past shown the zeal which we have shown have at the eleventh hour their colleges. But why on that account should we, who have been foremost in the fight, and who have been encouraged to spend vast sums of money, be told that we are to open our doors to those whom we do not want? Why is this cuckoo policy to be pursued? We have built our nests for a special object; why are these cuckoo eggs to be laid in them by those who have built no nests at all? I should like that question carefully answered.

This is a practical grievance at the moment because we have not sufficient room in our training colleges for our own students. I would instance the case of our training college at Hull, which only holds ninety students and to which there were the other day 300 applicants. As I understand these regulations, the Catholic students clamouring at our doors are to be set aside for non-Catholic students if the post happens to bring the application of the non-Catholic student before that of the Catholic student. We are to have no means of discrimination. When there are so many Catholic applicants why should any be set aside for non-Catholic students? It is a question which must be asked in the name of common honesty and decency, for if such a thing were to be done it would be a most monstrous breach of common decency and a gross injustice.

The noble Earl the Lord President mentioned the deputation, of which I had the honour of forming one, which waited upon the Prime Minister to-day. The Minister for Education was present as well as the noble Earl the Lord President. We had not the advantage of hearing the noble Earl, but we did hear the Prime Minister and the President of the Board of Education. The Minister for Education assured us that our fears were really groundless, that non-Catholic students would not come to our colleges, and that we need not be afraid; but the Prime Minister, on the other hand, seemed to take some satisfaction in thinking they would come, for he told us what a lot of good they would do us when they did come. That shows that the Government have not made up their minds as to what may be expected to happen—a perplexity which is shared by others. It was stated by a member of the deputation that someone imbued with an intense hatred of our religion might come into one of our colleges, and it has been said that in such a case we might convert him. I fear the annals of our education will not show that that is a general result. In my opinion it is unlikely that men who feel intense hatred of our religion will come to our colleges, but those superior individuals who sneer at the religion of those about them are more dangerous than the outward blasphemer, and the presence of a very few such would quickly break up the harmonious religious character which we wish to maintain in our training colleges.

It has been my lot for more than thirty years constantly to meet, on Committees of your Lordships' House, His Majesty's inspectors, and to hear their reports on our training colleges. I do not in the least wish to quote them as saying that what the Government suggests would be hostile to the good work done by training colleges; but those inspectors have year after year paid a tribute to the good work that has been done for culture and refinement in training colleges under nuns. The most rev. Primate spoke of the desirability of bringing to this work of education persons of refinement and culture. In our training colleges we have had to take many who were uncultured and not in the worldly sense highly-refined, and to bring culture and refinement to them, and report after report of inspectors of the Board of Education has shown that in that great work we have done excellently and well. This has been due to the fact that in these institutions there is a harmony of religious belief and a fellowship in religious worship, a daily guiding by those in charge of the institution of the students under their care, a family life based upon religion; and we feel that this may be materially jeopardised and cruelly broken into if others who do not share these religious beliefs are allowed to come within our walls. I do not speak of them as individuals. If they are admitted on proper conditions, if they come with the request to be allowed to enter and agree to accept the discipline they find there, that is one thing; but if they have a right to demand admission and come there knowing that no one can say them nay, it is not taking a narrow and circumscribed view to say that that must have a deleterious effect upon the character of our colleges.

I will not now go into the question of secondary schools, but I may say that we have just over forty such institutions. We are a body who have had great difficulties to contend with, but we do believe that in our secondary schools we have taken not an ignoble share in the educational work of the country; yet the effect of the present proposals will be most harmful to those schools. The head of the Roman Catholic communion in this country felt obliged at to-day's deputation, in gentle terms, but with great firmness, to say distinctly to the Prime Minister that Roman Catholics felt these proposals to be an encroachment in the domain of conscience, and that we should be obliged to disregard some of these regulations. This determination has also been expressed in the strongest and most unequivocal terms by a largely-attended meeting of Catholic laymen, held in connection with the deputation and including many ardent supporters of the Liberal Party, who feel that a great wrong is being done.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, the noble Marquess who opened this debate asked my opinion upon a legal question. He wished to know whether the Board of Education will have any legal power to distribute to local authorities any part of the sum of £100,000 recently voted for providing new public elementary schools, until Section 96 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, has been repealed. There is no doubt that the Act and section to which he refers does provide that no Parliamentary grant shall be made in aid of the building, or enlarging, or improving, or fitting up any elementary school. That is a direction in an Act of Parliament in regard to what shall be done hereafter.

But it is an acknowledged maxim of law that this being what is called a sovereign Parliament, it can pass any law, or qualify or alter any law if it thinks fit. No section of an Act of Parliament can prevent subsequent Parliaments from doing what they think it right to do. Under these circumstances, an estimate is put down, and I believe a Resolution has been passed in the House of Commons for a sum of £100,000 for the building of new public elementary schools. This has not yet, I think, found its way into an Act of Parliament or a Bill. When it does, it will, I presume, follow the usual course of Appropriation Bills, and it will read—

> "That the sums granted by the Act are appropriated and shall be deemed to have been appropriated as from the date of the passing of the Act as mentioned in Schedule A for the services and purposes expressed in Schedule B annexed hereto."

That means that with the assent of both Houses of Parliament there will then be a direction to appropriate £100,000 to this particular purpose. As a matter of law—I am not speaking now of the constitutional question—any Court below will acknowledge and obey that as an Act of Parliament. It seems to me that that is plain.

Then comes the constitutional question. The noble Marquess asks me whether it would be constitutional, as apart from the strictly legal aspect. For my part I speak with all deference on these subjects and with some misgiving, because a few weeks ago I had the misfortune to state my opinion on a question of constitutional law, and I was mortified to find my noble friend Lord Halsbury took a different view. I regretted such a proceeding very much, for I do not like discord of that kind to appear. I do not think this can be called unconstitutional. It is a matter of opinion whether it is improper or not—that is a question of propriety. I do not think there is anything unconstitutional or irregular in it, and for my part I do not think it is improper. The only precedent or analogous case that I can recall was a case in which, in the early years of the eighties, there was an Act which prescribed the maximum salary of magistrates in Ireland, and notwithstanding that Act, after a discussion in Parliament about 1883, Governments on both sides have passed and sanctioned by Appropriation Acts larger salaries than the maximum laid down in the earlier Act. That is the only precedent I can recall now. I did not know this question would be asked, and I have not had time to look the matter up.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I do not desire to intervene in the general debate, but merely to say a word with reference to the constitutional and legal aspects of the case. Of course we all recognise that Parliament has power to do almost anything by Act of Parliament, but I do not think that is quite the question. It is certainly only part of the question. Here is a great change suddenly sprung by the Minister for Education, without notice or warning, dealing not with a petty thing such as the addition of an extra £200 to the salaries of four of the magistrates of Ireland, but with a large sum of money and a large question of policy, and it is done by the Minister for Education with the knowledge that it is right in the teeth of the Act of Parliament. My noble friend on the Woolsack, who, I am sure, would never, in interpreting our laws, say anything which did not commend itself to his legal judgment, and for whose opinion I have the highest respect, did not, it was obvious, feel at all so strong as to the omnipotence of Parliament when he came to the constitutional aspect of the question. All that my noble and learned friend could bring himself to say with reference to that was that he would not say it was unconstitutional. That is a different thing from saying, "I am of opinion that, in constitutional law, this is constitutional." The Lord Chancellor has not said that.

Lord Loreburn.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I certainly never trimmed my language in that way. What I said I mean—that this is not in violation of anything that is constitutional in the full sense of the word.

LORD ASHBOURNE: I at once accept that statement. What is the meaning of "constitutional?" It means that a thing is in accordance with fixed usage and settled practice. I say that this is not in accordance with fixed usage and settled practice. The sudden statement of a great change in the educational policy of the country, and involving the expenditure of a great sum of money, deliberately, in the teeth of an Act of Parliament still on the Statute-book, cannot be said to be in strict accordance with fixed usage, and cannot possibly be called constitutional. In all the history of this country my noble and learned friend was only able to give one precedent. And what was that? Poor Ireland! It is always appealed to for precedents. The only precedent the Lord Chancellor could recall was that twenty-three or twenty-four years ago four magistrates in Ireland were allotted extra duties and were given £200 extra salary. I maintain that that instance of a trifling payment is a very different thing from this. I contend that this cannot be fitly described as a constitutional proceeding.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I must apologise for rising so near the dinner hour, but I have a special reason for asking your Lordships to grant me your indulgence now. I do not pretend for a moment to discuss the legal question, but I think, after what the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has said, everyone will feel that the action proposed by the Government is strictly legal. I also think it is bringing in a very big word to appeal to the constitution in connection with a Parliamentary practice which we happen not to like. It is very difficult to say what is constitutional. But to a certain extent I associate myself with the criticisms of those who do not like this method of amending an Act of Parliament by means of the

Appropriation Bill. I put it on the ground of Parliamentary practice. I feel that if we are to amend a clause in a general Act that has gone through Parliament with full discussion, it is only fair that the other House—it does not affect your Lordships' House, which is not concerned with money matters—should have the same full control by power of debate at all stages. Therefore I, personally, regret the introduction of a practice which may constitute a very evil precedent in future years. In my opinion the course adopted is injurious to the efficiency of Parliamentary debate. But I do think if there was one person in this House who had no right to give expression to the very lofty language which he used in condemning the action of the Government it was the noble Marquess opposite, Lord Londonderry. Here, in order to get over a difficulty, a method has been adopted of a peculiar character; but, at any rate, the method, if successful, does get out of the difficulty in accordance with law. But I would remind the noble Marquess of the line he took when he was Lord President of the Council in October, 1902, just on the eve of the Act of that year becoming law. When that Act became law it had the effect of exempting managers of voluntary schools from every financial liability except that of keeping their buildings in order. What did the noble Marquess do on that occasion? He called together a formal conference of all his inspectors and addressed to them an allocution as to the way in which they should discharge their duties; and in addressing the inspectors whose duty it would be to draw attention to structural deficiency and to support the action of the local authorities who called for structural improvements the noble Marquess told them that, without in any way wishing to lay down a hard-and-fast rule, he would deprecate a too rigid application of building rules and playground regulations. The noble Marquess called his staff together, and said that here was an Act under which voluntary managers would have to put their buildings in order, but he did not wish the rules to be rigidly enforced. I therefore maintain that the noble Marquess has put himself out of court in regard to complaining of the action now taken by the Government in this matter.

The important point in the debate has been the question of secondary schools and training colleges, and the position in regard to both is in many respects the same. The Government have provided, in the case of secondary schools, that in future there shall only be one type of school aided with public money—the type of school which is either under public management, or, at any rate, in which the majority of the governors are appointed by a public body; it shall also be a type of school in which what I may call the official religious instruction, if any, shall be of an undenominational character. Henceforward new schools may be established by denominations, and six out of thirteen of the governors may be denominational. I do not think that if Roman Catholics were to start a college in, say, Liverpool, and were to provide that there should be a governing body of thirteen, of whom six should be appointed by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Liverpool and seven by the Liverpool Education Authority, they would have much trouble, and I have very little doubt that that new school would be worked on the lines that Catholic schools are worked on now. The only difference would be that, instead of everyone receiving Catholic instruction in the school who did not withdraw, the parents would have to make application for definite Catholic instruction. Curiously enough, that, from the passing of the Act of 1870, has been the practice in the board schools of Liverpool, that is, parents have applied for their children to receive religious instruction, not to be exempted from it. I do not think myself that persons who want to start denominational schools will find any practical difficulty. The secondary schools which receive Parliamentary grants are not the great residential public schools, but schools of a humbler character—day schools mainly. No one disputes the propriety of a conscience clause in a day school. I do not think that with regard to secondary schools these regulations will make a material alteration. The old schools will continue to receive the old grants from Parliament; the new and enlarged grants will be paid to new schools which conform to the new type.

I turn to the training colleges, in connection with which much more feeling has been aroused among friends of denominationalism than in connection with secondary schools. If the most rev. Primate will excuse me, I will say that though he two or three times disclaimed the wish to deal with technicalities and expressed the desire to deal with the broad aspects of the case, yet I think in fact his speech was too much occupied with technicalities, and he failed adequately to grapple with the broad aspects. The real question is, Are you prepared in the existing denominational training colleges frankly to accept students who do not belong to your denomination? That is the essential question. I read with very great interest the full report in *The Times* of the audience which the Archbishop and those who went with him received from the Prime Minister and the Minister for Education, and I noticed that the leading representative of training colleges, Canon Morley Stevenson (Principal of Warrington Training College), who is this year Chairman of the Association of Training Colleges, was more liberal than the great bulk of the speakers. He said—

> "They recognised that the time had come when some place must be found within their colleges for those who belonged to other denominations, and they accepted the spirit of the conscience clause."

I wish that the most rev. Primate could have spoken to us in the same words. If he had said that, we should have got much further on the way to agreement.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I venture to think I did in substance urge the very same thing, and I not only expressed a desire for it, but contended that by our supplementary hostels it was being actually done.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: I will tell the most rev. Primate why I think his profession fell short of what we desire. He limits his willingness to accept students to day students. There was no such reservation in the speech of Canon Morley Stevenson. The essential thing is that it should be recognised that in colleges largely maintained by public money meritorious students should be able to come in without being limited by the denominational character of the college. There is nothing very terrible in that. Experience has shown that the conscience clause works very smoothly and quietly when it is once introduced. Will any right rev. Prelate familiar with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge say that since the residential colleges were thrown open, without limitation of creed and sect, the life of those colleges has not been sweetened and the spiritual life improved? I have not looked up any quotations to justify myself in this, but I remember seven or eight years ago at a Church Congress an older don at Oxford than I was—the Rev. Mr. Ince—who was a pillar of the Conservative Party and opposed the reforms which threw open the University, making a speech in which he admitted that the abolition of the wrangles that existed at Oxford while tests were in force had been salutary and beneficial to the spiritual as well as the social life of the place.

The British and Foreign Colleges have lived perfectly happily, and have had as good a home life among students of various religious belief as Church colleges. Good work has also been done by the Home and Colonial College, which has always admitted Nonconformists within its walls. One might multiply examples, and say that this conscience clause, which is to you such a bug-bear before you experience it, will, as a matter of fact, work very smoothly when you have it. Roman Catholics do undoubtedly stand a little outside the general pale of English life and English society. They are suffering because they have pooled their cause with the Established Church of England. Ten or twelve years ago if people had combined upon a national system of education free from ecclesiastical interference, terms for special groups of the population, like Catholics and Jews would have been willingly recognised; but if people will fight to the last with dangerous allies the time will come when they will go down with the allies with whom they have been associated.

The most rev. Primate talked of the large sums which have been spent, and which are now being spent, upon the colleges. We know, of course, the case of Kennington. We have heard it very often, and it is a very creditable instance of public spirit. But the great mass of these Church training colleges were founded between 1840 and 1851, and does the House know what the state was as to public aid and private contributions at the time they were founded and after? In 1851, Canon Moseley, the inspector, reported that in regard to Church colleges for men the Government paid 10 per cent., the students 30 per cent., and voluntary subscriptions covered more than 50 per cent.; and at that time an official letter was written to Canon Moseley by Mr. Lingen, afterwards Lord Lingen, conveying the warning to Church colleges that they had no right to suppose that the grants they were then receiving were to be a vested interest, or that they could go on indefinitely relying upon State aid, while they were exclusively denominational in their character. That letter will be found on pages 213 and 214 of the Education Report, 1851–2.

The Established Church has never failed to get, year by year, better and better terms from the State. The Church has been what I may call the spoilt child of the State in matters of Parliamentary aid. In 1857, they had brought down their share of contributions from over 50 per cent. to 26 per cent., and the then inspector of Church training colleges for women, after giving the figures, wrote as follows—

> "These returns corroborate the opinion I expressed last year. On the whole, the institutions are prosperous. Doubtless some difficulty is experienced in keeping up the annual subscriptions, but the amount now received ought to not be diminished. It is a small contribution considering that these institutions belong to the diocese in which they stand, and are entirely managed by local authorities."

Suppose the Church had to find 25 per cent. from voluntary contributions. Why, they could not subsist for a moment.

Every existing Church college is left practically undisturbed. The Church has the whole of the appointments of the staff, the whole of the domestic arrangements, and all that they are called upon to do is to accept students by merit without regard to faith. I agree with the most rev. Primate that if this were a Committee discussion on the details of this Code there are many points worthy of consideration. I agree with him that most serious difficulty is thrown on the heads of training colleges by the abolition of all the old guides by which they were able to determine who were the best qualified of the students. Those things have greatly increased the difficulty of the authorities. Now it is suggested that we should go back to the class system. It is essential that that should be done, but if the most rev. Primate and those who act with him would come forward and say: "We will accept your principle, we will in good faith not have regard to the fact whether the applicant is a Churchman or a Nonconformist, but whether he or she is of good character, ability, and disposition for the teaching profession, and we will take them on those terms," then I feel certain that they could be met with all sorts of reasonable regulations as to admission.

But it is no use dealing with these difficulties of detail when we are at a question of principle. I will make a further concession to the most rev. Primate. The Code contemplates that hostels will continue to exist, not under the name of hostel, but under the name of lodging-house. There are two words which I should like to see disappear from this Code—that women living in lodgings will be recognised "at present." I think that to put in the words "at present" with reference to a particular part of the Code is a sort of note of warning, a sort of threat of the possibility of withdrawal which does not apply to other parts of the Code; and I am anxious that every facility shall be given to these denominations to establish what in fact will be hostels, and if they are willing to establish hostels I should like to see the wording of the Code show complete impartiality in that matter. I think it is not unfair for the Board of Education to say that if you want to have your special atmosphere in your hostels you must not expect the Government to pay the whole of the cost; yet I think the difference which applies in the case of women of £5 is reasonable, and I should be glad if the same small sum were applied in the case of men. I have no objection to hostels if young people prefer to go into them. While I think that those who advocate this special advantage for the denomination should not expect the community to bear the whole cost, yet I think if a very moderate difference were introduced that might meet the position. There are other things I would have said but for the fact that your Lordships are desirous of suspending the sitting for dinner.

Before sitting down I would emphasise the fact that it must be recognised at the present day that public opinion demands two things. It demands that the institutions for the public training of our nation shall be as far as possible under public management. The community is determined to assume control of its own education, and not to delegate it to ecclesiastical societies. And, secondly, the community is determined that, as far as possible, the career of the teacher shall be open to the most meritorious on equal terms. So long as there is a scarcity of accommodation in the training colleges the nation has a right to demand that the fittest shall have the first choice. Let us endeavour to secure a sufficient number of training colleges, and then have the most absolute belief that the natural disposition of the students will lead them to the institutions most congenial to them.

*The LORD BISHOP of ST. ALBANS said he would like, in beginning what he had to say, to acknowledge the very conciliatory tone of the noble Lord who had just spoken. He could not help feeling as he heard him that if they had to deal with him as the Minister for Education instead of with Mr. McKenna they would really have a better chance of coming to terms. There were many things which he said with which he entirely agreed in spirit, and therefore, while he was obliged to criticise the main conclusion at which the noble Lord had arrived, he desired to express a great deal of agreement with various points he had brought out in his speech. The main point which it appeared to him had been raised on behalf of the Government was the supposed obligation in reference to public money of applying the conscience clause to the training colleges. He took the word "oblige" from the President of the Council, who said they felt obliged to apply the conscience clause to the training colleges and in that way, he (the rev. Prelate) would not say wholly to undenominationalise them, but certainly with regard to the new colleges to insist upon their being undenominational. When did this argument of public money really begin to be realised? He ventured to say it was not realised at all last year. When did the Government wake up to the supposed obligation of imposing a conscience clause on the training colleges? Last year the President of the Board of Education in many ways gave encouragement to the training colleges. He explained that there was great misconception on the part of Nonconformists with reference to the position of the training college grants. He defended these grants as being grants not really made to the colleges, and not really to subsidise the religious bodies which provided them, but as grants given in the nature of scholarships which it would be wrong to prevent the owners taking to this or that college they chose to adopt. He ventured to say that the President of the Council went even further. He did not merely defend the training colleges, but he gave them every sort of encouragement in the policy they had suggested, which they were prepared to carry out, and had to a certain extent already carried out, and which he would call the hostel policy. They opened hostels in connection with their denominational colleges in which they might admit others than those of their own religious body, and in connection with the new training colleges which were wholly of an undenominational character they had been asked by the parents of a large number of students to open hostels of a religious and distinctly denominational character. Last year the Government had not come to a conclusion adverse to the training colleges, and he would ask their Lordships to notice that last year was after the General Election, when, surely if they had come to the conclusion that they had any mandate from the country at all, they must have come to it then. He maintained, therefore, that last year after the General Election, they had not come to any decision to undenominationalise the training colleges or to impugn the policy of their grants. What had caused this change of policy? Was it the failure of the Government to carry their Education Bill through the House?

Was it a general feeling in the country that had so stirred the Government as to induce them to adopt this new and revolutionary policy? He could only say for himself that he had never witnessed such an extraordinary feeling as pervaded and permeated the whole country last year in connection with that Bill, and he wholly failed to understand what had happened since to make it necessary to impose this new policy upon the training colleges at large. The policy of the Government, as was so well expounded by a Member of the Government last year, was not to subsidise the colleges as colleges, but to give scholarships to men and women who had earned them. What the Government required was the finished product. They were not able to produce it, and they wanted a teacher who had undergone a long training, who had been under discipline, who had learned to teach, and who had the *morale* which would enable him to give the necessary training and influence. When they had obtained that finished product; when he or she had received his or her parchment, then, and not till then, was the payment made by the Government. That was the policy on which hitherto the grants had been made, and it was, he ventured to say, a sound policy. Successive Governments had acknowledged that it was not in their power to produce this result themselves. They offered every inducement to other bodies to found colleges from which that product might issue, and, if the Church of England had to a large extent taken advantage of the requests of successive Governments to open colleges under the offers made to them and others had not, did she deserve to be mulcted in the way she was mulcted now, and was the Government justified in taking her colleges in order that they might do the work which the Government acknowledged they themselves could not do? When he came to the equity of the situation it seemed to him there were certain things which ought to be said. He was, first of all, entitled to say that there had been ever since 1839 a consecutive policy on the part of successive Governments in reference to the training college grants. He believed the first Order in Council was dated 1839, and that by it authority was given to give £10,000 to certain training colleges. Ever since that decision there had been Orders in Council and grants made, and there had been various codes formed with reference to the training colleges. Never, however, between 1839 and 1907 had there been any sort of variation in the policy under which Governments had administered the grants; and he submitted that on the grounds of equity they were entitled to ask why that confirmed policy, which had elicited from the religious bodies such large sums of money which would not have been given except upon the faith of it, had been abandoned, and what was the equity of the revolution they had in the regulations this year.

He wished to say a word with reference to the trust deeds. When the Government promised grants to training colleges in earlier years for building and in late years for maintenance, the one thing which they required was some satisfactory trust deeds. Those trust deeds were various, and they would all have to be very carefully scanned and examined. The Governments of the day, however, had given their grants upon the faith of those trust deeds, knowing perfectly well what they contained; and now by the regulations of the Government—not by any statute—the training colleges were to be asked to do things which were contrary to their trust deeds, on the faith of which the colleges were built, and on the faith of which the grants were originally given. He wanted to come to the question of the money itself. The noble Lord who preceded him made some capital out of the admission, an admission which he perfectly conceded, that in late years the contributions towards the maintenance of the training colleges had been gradually less. He said that they had become more and more dependent upon the Government for their maintenance. He (the Lord Bishop) conceded the fact that in reference to maintenance the ordinary subscriptions had been less than they were some years ago; but it was remarkable that it was just that period which had witnessed some reduction of the contributions given by the religious bodies to the maintenance of the training college that had been marked by the most extraordinary advance in the subscriptions for plant. The most rev. Prelate referred to the sum, he thought, of £200,000 which had been subscribed in the last twelve years. He had tried to go into it as far as he could, and he noticed the following results. The sum of £92,613 was given by grants from the Government for the building of Church of England training colleges before 1870, and he found upon evidence given before the Education Commission of 1886 by a former Secretary of the Board of Education that the sum subscribed was three times the amount of the Government grant; giving the sum of £277,839. St. Gabriel's, Kennington, had been built at a cost of £60,000. It accommodated 160 students; and besides St. Gabriel's they had provided 1,390 other places since 1870 in their various training colleges. St. Gabriel's thus cost more than £300 per place, and the other 1,390 places could not possibly have been provided at less than £200 per place. He was speaking the other day to the superintendent of a lunatic asylum, who said they could not provide a place for a lunatic under £200, and they were putting it very low for a training college if they put it at £200 per place. At £200 per place for 1,390 students they had the sum of £278,000, and this added to the other items made a total of £615,839, of which £338,000 had been given since 1870, the larger part in the last twelve years. When they were calculating what the Church of England had given for religious training colleges, it was not fair simply to say that only a small proportion had been given towards maintenance and that a decreasing proportion. They were bound to take into consideration the enormous sums spent upon plant; sums larger apparently as the ordinary subscriptions for the maintenance of the colleges had diminished. He ventured to say that on the grounds of the very large expenditure not only of the Church of England but of the Roman Catholics and other religious bodies the question of equity was one which pressed and that the revolution in policy was not equitable considering all the circumstances of the past.

The Lord Bishop of St. Albans.

He wanted now to say a word on what he might call the variety of type that was absolutely desirable whether in the training of teachers or of children. A policy of dead monotony was very bad. He believed it was a very bad thing to have only one type of school in the country. He was quite certain that the more they could vary their education and the more types they could have the better it would be for the country at large. There were two main types in reference to religious education. There was the denominational and the undenominational. He wanted to do justice to both. Out of the undenominational type as represented by the board schools they had had—and he gladly acknowledged it—very good results. He was not the man to decry what had been done by the board schools of the country or to decry what had come out of the undenominational type of school; but he did say that to crush the denominational type and exalt the undenominational was from an educational point of view absolutely unsound. They wanted a variety of types and not a dull monotony, and he believed the best kind of type came not from the undenominational but from the denominational side. Whether it was better or worse, however, he claimed that at any rate on the ground of the evil of monotony it was an absolutely bad thing to crush one kind of type in favour of another. This change of policy had interrupted real progress in filling up places and supplying fresh places for teachers. They were all entirely conscious of the desire, not only on the part of the teachers, but of all educationists that every kind of teacher should have the opportunity of being trained. He did not for one moment yield to Lord Stanley in the desire that every teacher, whatever his religious belief, should have the opportunity of being trained and of becoming as good a teacher as it was possible for him to be. Last year they were all bent upon the policy of providing hostels all over the country. They had, to a large extent, already begun in the college with which he was connected at Bishops Stortford. They had built a hostel for twenty young women; it was working extremely well, and they were prepared to enlarge it.

Other colleges had done the same, and last year they had every encouragement from the Board of Education itself to persevere not only in this policy but in founding denominational hostels in connection with undenominational colleges. If this had gone on, in a few years time they would have had a large accession to the training colleges and hostels, and would have had this want greatly supplied. The Government had now given them regulations which really provided no new places at all, which simply provided for a shifting of places, and would not add permanently to the educational efficiency of the country.

He wanted to say something on what he must call character. The regulations on this ground were very much to be lamented. They wanted not merely clever teachers, but teachers of brain and character, teachers who would be able to influence others, not merely by the way in which they taught religion, but by being religious teachers in everything. When they sent their own sons and relations to public schools, they looked out for schools where there were men who were able to inspire them, men who had character and were likely to mould the character of their sons as they would desire to see them moulded. Character was a very delicate thing indeed. It was far more than religious teaching. It came out in everything. A good teacher of high character showed his character in everything, in the way he did his work, in the consideration he showed for the child, in the way in which he gave a natural history lecture, and in countless ways, and that was what they wanted. If they were going to do anything to weaken character and to weaken the influences that made character, they would not be doing anything good for the country at large. If this was so, then by discouraging the denominational training colleges they were really inflicting a blow upon the character which was so delicate and of such untold value. He believed it to be absolutely certain that the highest and best character depended upon religious conviction, and, when they had religious conviction on the part of those who were concerned with the training colleges, and yet a real liberality and desire to show every consideration to others who might be of a different form of belief, he believed they had the best guarantee of the character they wanted to see planted in their children. From this point of view the regulations were singularly unfortunate. They really struck a blow at character, and for that reason they would take, in his judgment, a very retrograde step in the history of education. He gave credit to the Government for a real desire to do what they believed for the best of the country. He gave as much credit to them for their motives in the matter as he claimed for those with whom he more particularly agreed; but it was to them a matter so sacred and so essential, that the Government must pardon them if they protested against regulations which violated every policy that was sound and good, and which certainly in their judgment boded ill for the country at large.

LORD HERRIES wished to refer to the fact that under the regulations it would be necessary that 25 per cent. of the students in secondary schools must have free places. He had heard several authorities on the subject of secondary education, and they one and all condemned the necessity of having 25 per cent. of the places free in every school. It appeared to him quite possible, if not probable, that men who were well able to pay for the secondary education of their children would send them to a primary school in order to get them into a secondary school free afterwards. The result would be that the country would pay for the education of boys and girls whose parents were well able to pay for them themselves. He could not but think that that consideration had not been brought before those who had drawn up the regulations. It was an instance of the careless manner in which they had been drawn up. He was quite certain that if the country found out that they were paying for the secondary education of the children of those who could well afford to pay they would turn round on the county councils and say, "Why are we obliged to pay for the education of the children of those who can afford to pay?" All the county councils would be able to answer would be, "We are forced by the regulations of the Government." The regulations had been sprung upon the country, and they were forced to accept them without any opportunity of refusing them. The fact was the Government was prepared to wage war against all denominational education, and, having been defeated in their direct attack upon primary education, they were now prepared by a flank attack to cut off supplies. By undenominationalising the teachers, they were endeavouring to prevent denominational education being given in the country. If teachers were not brought up in denominational schools they would not be able to give in denominational schools that religious teaching which was naturally expected of them. Of course, it was quite right that there should be a conscience clause in day schools. No one had any objection to that. Would any member of the Government, however, be prepared to send his sons to a residential school, frequented by people of every denomination, if it was not necessary for them to attend any religious exercises whatever? He thought he would not, but would require that wherever he sent them they should be obliged to attend some religious services. When it came, however, to the question upon which the future of the country depended, they were told that they were going to any denominational college and could absent themselves from any religious exercises whatever. He was not sure they could not absent themselves from grace before meals. They might say it was a religious exercise. It was quite possible they would be students who were atheists or Mohamedans, or Jews, forcing themselves upon denominational schools and training colleges. How were they going to prevent them? If they applied first, they must under the Regulations be accepted, providing in other ways they had a good moral character. They would perhaps have Mohamedans going about advocating polygamy, and the Jew objecting when he got pork or ham for dinner. These sort of things would go on in residential schools. There must be some religious bond to keep them together. He could not understand how anyone who believed in religious education could insist that people of all denominations should go to the residential training schools where they could get no benefit whatever from the religious training and where it was quite possible they might do harm to those around them. They were told that the teachers, even in all the public schools, would teach the Cowper-Temple clause. How would they be able to teach that amount of Christianity found in the Cowper-Temple clause if they received no religious training themselves? He would suggest that the Government next year should insist that those who attended the training colleges should attend some place of worship where they could acquire some belief in a future life. The whole of our civilisation depended upon religion; it was the foundation of our morals, and, if they were going to have teachers in the schools of the future who would ignore this fact, how could they expect that the future generations would be worthy of the country they inherited, and able to transmit to their descendants that civilisation of which Englishmen were so proud, and to maintain that opinion which England had so well deserved in the world for the moral behaviour of her citizens? No one was more anxious than himself that the position we had in the world should be handed down to those who came after us, and when he saw the result of secular education in foreign countries, how crime increased and how life was no longer as sacred as it used to be, he was more impressed than ever with the necessity for having religion inculcated in the schools. He did not confine himself to his own religion but spoke of that religious spirit which he was happy to say existed throughout the country. He for one would be sorry to think it would ever diminish; he hoped it would always continue, but it could only do so through the medium of the schools of the country.

*The LORD BISHOP of SOUTHWARK said that it was satisfactory that the debate had shown that this was not a matter merely of administrative detail, but that it went deep into those principles upon which, whatever their different views, they thought that the national system of education should be based. He hoped that it had been sufficiently brought out that they were not in any way standing upon merely a property claim or a historical claim. There was one remark of Lord Stanley which appeared to imply that it was because the Church of England and other bodies had done great things in the past that they were making this claim that night. The noble Lord seemed to impute that rather to the most rev. prelate. He thought everyone who had listened to the most rev. prelate's speech would agree that there was nothing upon which he insisted so little as that. He did indeed insist, as other speakers had insisted, on what had been done more recently and was being done at this very hour for the extension of church training colleges; but it was in no sense a cleaving to the past. It seemed to him that they might very fairly and boldly claim that the system upon which they had been working was an open system, and the system upon which they desired to work was an open system. The State insisted upon the training of the teacher. It made the training of the teacher possible by giving a grant to every teacher trained, but it left it to those who would to provide institutions in which the training should be given. Of course, there was a period up to a certain date when the State not only felt free and able to allow that to be done, but to help in the doing of it. That ended in 1870, and so far that was a change of policy, but since then it had been left free to everyone to provide teaching. They were going now to impair that system. It was quite true that if they described the existing system as an open system they would be met by some rather sharp and ironical criticism. They would be asked: "Do you mean to say that the Nonconformist has hitherto had the same chance of getting a good residential training as a Churchman? Have you never heard that a better qualified more capable Nonconformist was unable to find a place when a less capable and less qualified Churchman found one? Have you never heard it said that the Nonconformist was exposed to a temptation of adopting in a temporary and shallow way the character of a Churchman? And you are responsible for putting that stumbling block in the Nonconformist's path." He did not think the case could be more strongly put than that. Were they justified, nevertheless, in saying that the system was an open one? It seemed to him that they were. The field was open, only it was in great part unoccupied, and it had always been to him a matter of great regret that whilst the Church of England, and as they had heard the Roman Catholics, had done their part so effectually in the training colleges, so small an area comparatively was occupied by good men of other convictions. They did occupy an area certainly, for there were some excellent colleges of an undenominational character, but they formed only a small part of the whole system. He always felt inclined to put the question: Who was to blame for that? Was the Church of England or were the Roman Catholics to blame for it? It seemed to him most unreasonable to blame them for doing their bit when the chance was given to people of all sorts of doing their bit also. He would not willingly say one provocative word on the subject: and certainly he would not wish to say any pharisaical word, and therefore as regarded the failure of Nonconformists to take an equal part, he would only say that they at any rate owed the Church the justice of acknowledging the part she had played. He could not himself but think that the Nonconformists might, if they would, have done and might do more in this direction. But he would go a step further. The Government was not encumbered by scruples which would entangle some of them in discriminating between one form of religious teaching and another. The Government, therefore, would have no difficulty, if they thought it right, in making a grant towards building undenominational colleges. In fact a grant was now made of as much as 75 per cent. to the building of new undenominational day training colleges. They would have no difficulty in going further, if they thought well, and undertaking the whole cost of building an open or undenominational or neutral residential training colleges. If this residential accommodation were so much desired and if by the agreement of all it was valued so highly, the real remedy would be to increase the amount of it on various lines and not to harass those who, with an earnest conviction which, he thought, ought to command respect, with a great deal of sacrifice, and with efforts which were fresh and living to-day, had provided their own part in their own way. It seemed to him it was hardly a fair way of dealing with the matter. Let them help in whatever they could to encourage the enlargement of the system, but let them not lay mauling hands on what other people had provided. That was not quite all they had to say. He thought there was a very reasonable field for difference of opinion as to the exact effect of a conscience clause in a residential college. The conscience clause was sometimes said to date back to 1870. He thought it dated back further than that. He remembered that in the recommendations of the Endowed Schools Commission of 1868 a strong distinction was drawn between a conscience clause in a day school and a conscience clause in a place of residence, where the admission of others who were not in harmony and sympathy with the spirit of the system made such a difference and hindered the full putting out by the authorities of these powers of training and help which they possessed. He therefore thought there was a strong case for saying it was no narrowness, but a lack of real efficiency in the higher kinds of training, which made them want not to see the residential system watered down. They had been given, he was bound to say, not much argument, but a certain number of consolatory anticipations. Among the pious hopes held out to them was one that after all there would not be very many from outside who would come into the colleges and that the system would go on very much as it was, and so forth. These were all mere speculations, and one objection they had was that the way in which the matter had been brought in had not given them time to think about it and had not given the Government time to think whether the change could be made more considerate in this or that respect. Were they not bound to look at the change with regard to the conscience clause in the light of what lay behind it? Why, if they really wanted to maintain the equity of the system, if they really wanted to maintain, preserve, and continue the open system, had the Government issued these regulations? They might have pressed upon them the conscience clause for the colleges of the future as it was pressed upon them with regard to the colleges they had now, but that was not the policy of the Government. They forbade any extension of the old system, those who desired denominational colleges would have no opportunity of acting upon their convictions in the matter. He felt that that was a great encroachment upon freedom. He would put it in two ways. An individual, not a child but an adult, say a Roman Catholic, wanted to be trained. The Government said: "We want to see you trained and we give you some money by which you shall be trained for the service of the State and education." The teacher wanted to go where he could find the training in the form he preferred. The Government said: "No, there have been Roman Catholic colleges in the past, but there are not to be any more." They there conflicted with the liberty of the individual. But further, he was not in the least ashamed to claim liberty for religious bodies. It seemed to him that a wise and tolerant State would give liberty to the religious bodies to do their work if it was a wholesome work. The building of St. Gabriel's, Kennington, was a task which was on a par with the work of some of the cathedral builders of the past in the amount which had been lavished upon it. It was not an easy thing to do. If, however, they had a Roman Catholic or a Church community willing to do it, why in the name of equity should they not allow them to do it? He felt that they were interfering with liberty. He wished they had an opportunity of speaking to Nonconformists. He would very much prefer to speak to those who held the strings than to those whose strings were pulled. Certainly, speaking of Nonconformists behind their backs, they should be very careful not to say one ungenerous or unjust word. He should like so much the opportunity of asking Nonconformists what they really hoped to gain by this policy. They had an admittedly valuable thing in the residential training colleges. If they (the Nonconformists) forced their sons and their daughters into them one of two things must happen. Either they would find that the influences there were so warm, so strong, and so appealing that their sons and daughters might perhaps be drawn away from the principles they held dear; or (as the other alternative) they would damage that united sort of family life of which the noble Duke (the Duke of Norfolk) had spoken, and which they valued so much. He should very much like to ask them to consider that. They all agreed that the working of the educational system depended upon the teachers, but the teaching of one who would teach and the training of one who would train was an operation of the highest delicacy. They wanted to bring to bear upon it the noblest forces by which men and women were moved, they wanted to set up ideals to which they could aspire, and they wanted to bring to bear those influences which made discipline easy because submission was willing. They wanted teachers so trained not only, speaking as a Churchman, for their own schools, but for all the schools of the country, for the undenominational schools, and even if they were to have schools without a religious system they would still want such teachers if they knew their business as educators. They wanted people in whom the deepest springs had been touched and in whom the highest motives had been trained. He would therefore plead with them not to tamper with a system which had confessedly done such great things in the past. They had been told what the London School Board and the other great school boards in the past had done, and it was a matter of knowledge that whilst of course the undenominational colleges had contributed their contingent, a great deal of the best of that work had been done by teachers trained in Church colleges. It was not, he thought, a great step to add that they acquired a great deal of their excellence by that system which was congenial and normal in the colleges. When he had said these things to his Nonconformist friends, he should go further and say that if they could not agree with him in what he had said, could they not at least respect the feelings and the convictions of so large a body of their fellow-citizens as they knew the colleges represented? They represented great efforts in the past, and—he wished strongly to emphasise this—they represented an amount of conciliatory action in the recent past which he thought was a very creditable achievement in the educational field. He thought the movement initiated by the Duke of Devonshire as Minister for Education, welcomed by Archbishop Temple and readily agreed to by all who represented the Church as a thing which they could and would do, ought to be recognised and accepted as a really great piece of conciliatory action. He would put it concretely by one more reference to St. Gabriel's College. They built it out of Church money, with lecture or public rooms capable of taking twice as many students as the resident Church students, who were the primary object of the college: and then those who built the college took pains and spent money in equipping an hostel outside it which was made entirely open and undenominational. He doubted whether there was any parallel to this. They had before them this conciliatory action, and he would very much like to ask why it was necessary to make changes which would not add to the number of places, which would admit Nonconformists to a doubtful share in advantages that they might damage by sharing them, and which would cause such infinite discomfort and distress to their fellow-citizens and fellow-Christians.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY said he did not think he would have intervened in the debate had it not been that he represented a diocese which had recently done its very best to meet all the requirements of successive Governments. At Salisbury they had built a second training college a little distance from the original one for the very purpose of meeting the difficulty of the conscience clause for Nonconformist students. There was another instance of conciliatory action. They had done their very best, and now they were thrown into such confusion that the principal of their college did not know in the least what he was to do. It was with regard to the secondary schools, however, that he was most personally concerned. Quite recently, under the direction of the county council and the Board of Education, he was party to a scheme for a secondary school, and it had lately received the sanction of the Board of Education acting as Charity Commissioners. They did everything they thought could possibly conciliate those with whom they wished to work. They had no tests for teachers or scholars, but they had two safeguards. One was that the doctrine and worship of the Church of England should be taught every day in the school to those who desired to profit by them, and the other was that the elected governors and the governors appointed under the trust should be equal in number. Now they were told that that was to be changed, and that those two safeguards were to be swept away, Was it likely that he would have spent the considerable sum of money which he had spent in founding that school, if he had had the smallest idea that there would have been such a change so suddenly imposed upon this class of schools? It was really a very sad thing to perceive that it was no longer possible to trust His Majesty's Government to administer the law with fairness and equality. They were, as Churchmen, being almost forced to ally themselves with one political Party. He thought nothing could be worse for the Church or the country than that the Liberal Party should alienate the Church of England, and make it absolutely necessary that every good Churchman should be one of the opposite Party. He had never been a Party man, and he had done his best to discourage the clergy taking part in Party contests, but he really did not know that this would be possible in the future.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said they had waited for some time for the Government to reply, and it was with some astonishment that he noticed the reluctance of the Government to take part in the debate. Since the noble and learned Lord upon the Woolsack spoke before dinner they had listened to three speeches against the Government and not one word of reply had been made. He was not altogether surprised at the reluctance of the Government, but the House and country would observe that they were afraid of allowing the last word to those who spoke on that side of the House. The noble Lord who no

doubt would follow him would prefer to make his speech without any reply being made to him. He thought the country would form a just estimate of the strength of the case which could only be supported by methods of that description. There were two parts of the question which was put to the Government by his noble friend Lord Londonderry. He had very little to say with regard to the earlier part—the procedure of the Government in respect of the £100,000 grant. That had already been dealt with, being a legal question, by those in whose presence he should speak with the very greatest diffidence. If the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack delivered an opinion which he had had ample time to consider, he for one should not dream even of commenting upon it; but when the noble Lord left as it were the Judicial Bench and spoke of the propriety of the proceedings of the Government, then he was sure he would allow him to say with great respect that he did not speak as the highest Judge in the country, but as a partisan member of a partisan Government. The noble and learned Lord hardly dared to say it was a proper proceeding. There was just one cursory parenthesis in which he gave a verbal adherence to the propriety of the action of his colleagues.

. THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he would tell their Lordships the reason he did not enter upon it. He came and sat judicially at 10.30, and he had been fourteen hours at work. He had not had a minute to look into the question beyond the general approbation he gave some time ago. That was the only reason why he did not enter upon it. Otherwise, he would willingly have done his best to support his colleagues.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said he was very familiar with the difficulty of a Minister speaking under great pressure, and he was not surprised at the observation made by the noble Lord. He noticed that Lord Stanley of Alderley, who spoke without any official responsibility, frankly repudiated the proceeding of the Government, saying he thought it an improper proceeding and one which offered a precedent he was very sorry the Government had set up. The noble Earl the Lord

President referred to what Mr. Speaker had said in another place. He ventured to interrupt him to point out what Mr. Speaker had said. He was afraid he did not quote Mr. Speaker quite accurately. He had since referred to the statement and he found that Mr. Speaker said it was in the power of the House of Commons not to break the law but to disobey an Act of Parliament. The difference was not very great. Mr. Speaker went on to say that whether that was a proper proceeding he left to the conscience of the House of Commons. It would not be courteous to make any reflections on that organ of the House of Commons, he meant its conscience, but he had no doubt of the great respect every Member of that House paid to Mr. Speaker's opinion, and if anything would raise that conscience it would.

He had with regard to the other part of his noble friend's question noticed two tendencies about the Government. There had been, as it were, a hot fit and then there had been a cold fit. The action of the President of the Board of Education had, generally speaking, been an example of the hot fit; and the very stringent alterations in the position of the secondary schools from a denominational point of view no doubt emanated from him. The noble Earl the Lord President was very anxious to minimise the change which had been imported into the system of secondary schools, and he spoke with enthusiasm of the sort of dispensing power which would be left to the local education authority. Under the new regulations it was in the power of the local educational authority, by saying that a secondary school even with all its naked denominational character was essential for the due provision of secondary education in the district to save the school as it stood without the religious modifications, which the regulations would otherwise introduce. The Lord President said he thought that would be the common case. He wished to point out how absurdly the Government treated the law of the country. Under Section 4 of the Act of 1902 the local educational authority were not allowed to administer the rates which were in their power by making any distinction between school and school on account of religious considerations, but notwithstanding this the Government were putting it in their power to make a complete distinction and differentiation in the administration of education in regard to the taxpayers' money. They left the local authority to say whether a school was or was not to receive money, to withhold it from one denominational school and to give it to another. In the matter of the taxes it was within their complete discretion, but in the matter of the rates it was not. Could there be any greater satire upon the administration of the law than that the Government should permit such a difference between the administration of rates and taxes by the same authority. Lord Stanley had made a most interesting speech, and he wished to make one observation in respect of one point in it. Lord Stanley had tried to make the distinction, with which they were very familiar last year, between the position of the Roman Catholics and of the Church of England. He knew that would be a point very interesting to Lord Fitzmaurice, because he recollected that last year he reproved him (the Marquess of Salisbury) in the most solemn manner because he accused the Government of making a distinction, which Lord Stanley, the only supporter of the Government on the back benches, said ought to be made in respect of secondary schools. Lord Stanley had told the Duke of Norfolk that the only mistake the Catholics had made was in throwing in their lot with the Church of England, thus coming in for the same condemnation. They had it now in the most positive manner from the mouth of one of the principal supporters of the Government, and from one who, above all others, understood and spoke with authority upon the education question, that, in his opinion, there ought to be a distinction made between the treatment of Roman Catholics and the treatment of the Church of England; that the Roman Catholics ought to have privileges in respect of denomination in secondary schools which they would be quite ready to deny to the Church of England. He hoped the country would take note that the Liberal Government thought that in these matters the Roman Catholics ought to have better treatment than the Church of England.

He must say one word about the treatment of trusts by the Government.

His noble friend Lord Londonderry pressed upon the Government the extraordinary *rôle* which the Board of Education was playing in the matter of trusts; but he did not notice that the noble Earl said one word about it in reply. It was a very astonishing admission. The Board of Education, in respect of educational trusts, were the successors of the Charity Commissioners, who were the successors of the Court of Chancery. They always hoped, though some of them hardly believed, that when the transfer took place in 1899 of the powers of the Charity Commissioners in respect of educational endowments to the Board of Education they would be administered in the same spirit. It was a gloomy satisfaction to him that he was always a pessimist in this respect, and that when he had the honour of a seat in another place he, with a very small minority of Members, did his utmost to prevent the possibility of the Board of Education using their administrative powers for a purely partisan purpose. There was a great discussion at the time whether these powers were judicial, semi-judicial, or only administrative. It was more or less a verbal discussion, but he thought what was urged by the defenders of the new system was that at any rate those powers would be used fairly and equitably and not for partisan purposes. Yet they had in these regulations the Government offering what his noble friend called a bribe to trustees, who were bound by every rule which applied to trustees to administer their trust according to its terms, to go to the Board of Education for the purpose of having their trust deeds altered in a vital particular for the return of a sum of money, not, of course, to go into their own pockets, but for the schools of which they were the trustees. That appeared to him a most discreditable performance, and he would like to hear what possible defence the Government had for using the powers which the Board of Education had inherited from the Charity Commissioners for such a partisan purpose. Those schemes when they were altered had to be laid upon the Tables of both Houses of Parliament, and the Government must not complain if, having regard to the origin of the alterations and the extraordinary indifference which the Government had shown to proper fairness in the matter, they were to scrutinise them with great care, and, if they saw fit, decline to give their consent thereto. He wondered whom the Government consulted about the changes in regard to secondary schools. He had been looking at the Act of 1899. It not only provided that the powers of the Charity Commissioners in respect of educational endowments were to pass to the Board of Education, but it also provided for the establishment of a Consultative Committee. That was one of the principal clauses of the Act of Parliament, and to the Consultative Committee were to be referred any matters of educational interest which the Board of Education chose to refer to them. Had they chosen to refer this question to the Consultative Committee? It was a statutory committee, not a private committee, and he would like to ask what was its opinion on the new policy of the Government. He would turn now for a moment or two to the subject of the training colleges. It was really hardly necessary to discuss it in detail, because the case had been stated with such unexampled force in the brilliant speech of the most rev. Prelate. The difficulties of applying the regulations in regard to the training colleges, however, were not worked out at all by the President of the Council. He believed the noble Lord the President of the Council was one of the officials of the Education Department. He was not quite sure whether in all the great changes that had been made the President of the Council still retained his *locus standi* in that Department. If he did, it was astonishing that he should not be in a position to deal with the administrative difficulties which the most rev. Prelate had pointed out; the immense difficulty, that was to say, of the method which the Government had prepared for selecting the particular students who were to go to training colleges. Their Lordships would recollect that the most rev. Prelate had pointed out that they came from a great variety of sources, that some had passed the ordinary examination, that others had matriculated at the London University, and so on. How were they to be this one selected, and that one rejected, unless the authorities of the training colleges were allowed to have some selective power? There was an amazing list to be found in the register which Mr. McKenna told them they were to buy, in which the names were to be put precisely in accordance with the punctuality of the postman, and on no other ground whatever. That was the method which Mr. McKenna seemed to suggest they ought to adopt for selecting one candidate rather than another. This particular administrative difficulty was put before the Lord President by the most rev. Prelate, and yet they had not had a word in reply. Apparently the Lord President could not deal with it. He wondered whether the noble Lord who would follow him would be able to deal with it. He had his doubts. The regulations were the most absurd things that had ever been seen, and the expert who sat behind the Government had said so. Lord Stanley had said, not in such terms as he was using, but in terms sufficiently clear as coming from a friend of the Government, that these difficulties were perfectly real, and that the regulations as they stood could not be defended. There were some differences in the phases of the Government's mind, which he had called the hot fit and the cold fit in the matter of the training colleges. Mr. McKenna had approached the subject in a frame of mind of profound suspicion of the Church of England and other denominational authorities. No examination of any kind was to be allowed, for fear, he presumed, that an undue preference might be imported into an examination as between one candidate and another. Mr. McKenna's original intention, he thought, was that not even an interview should be permitted. At the deputation to the Prime Minister the President of the Board of Education defended this probable absence of examinations on the ground of the expenditure to which it would put the counties. When it was suggested to him that perhaps the denominations would be prepared to pay their fares to the place of examinaton, he roundly accused the denominations and the Church of England of not playing fair in the matter. If they were allowed anything of that kind, he said, there was no doubt that injustice might creep in. The Lord President, representing the cold fit, approached the subject in a very different frame of mind. Speaking of the danger of the denominations not playing the game, he said that no aggressive member of any denomination was to be turned out neck and crop. He now went further and suggested that probably the atmosphere of the Church Training Colleges would induce the student to change his religious opinions. He was so astonished when he heard the noble Earl make that observation that he hardly knew what to do. His mind went back to the discussions of last year when the great charge brought against Church schools was that the atmosphere was of such a penetrating character that the children of other denominations would be proselytised if they went there. Now, however, the noble Earl held it out as a desideratum in the case of the training colleges. He did not admit for a moment that they did proselytise in the elementary schools, but in the case of the training colleges the noble Earl had held out that very element of proselytising as a remedy for the injustice of the regulations. The extravagance of the argument showed what a weak case the noble Earl must have. The truth was that Mr. McKenna was so terrified at the possibility of undue influence that he was hardly willing there should be any process of selection at all. He asked then what it mattered whether they got the better or the worse candidate; they all, he said, had to be educated. He went such lengths that he was positively reproved there and then by the Prime Minister himself. The Prime Minister did not know the pitfalls so well as Mr. McKenna, and he, relying only upon his well-known Scottish shrewdness and common-sense, got up and said that what Mr. McKenna had said was perfectly absurd; it was eminently desirable that the best men should be selected. Lord Stanley, confirming the Prime Minister, said that that was the great object, as indeed any sensible man would say. The question was who were the best men. Evidently the best men were the most qualified or those likely to become most qualified to do the work they would be called upon to do. They were going to be called upon to teach, not only a great number of secular subjects, but also religion. That was admitted. The noble Earl the Lord President had reiterated upon behalf of the Government the statement that they were opposed to what was called the secular system, and he went so far as to imply that if the secular system were carried out it would have to be carried out by a different Government from that to which he belonged. It was therefore part of the policy of the Government that the teachers should teach religion, and the Prime Minister said they were to select the best men, the men most qualified to do the work they would be called upon to do. It was consequently impossible to resist the conclusion which was absolutely exacted by the process of argument to which he had called their Lordships' attention, that some regard ought be to had to religious efficiency, or rather, as he should put it, to the probability of the students being able to give good religious instruction when they were selected. He saw no escape from that conclusion, and, if that was so, who would provide the religious training and who was to judge whether the students were so far grounded in religious knowledge that they were likely to make good teachers of religion? Would the State do it? Everybody knew that the State refused to do it. He would not enter into the question whether the State ought to do it. It was sufficient for him that every single member of the Government who had spoken agreed in repudiating the notion that the State could investigate the religious competence of a particular student. If the State would not do it, why did they refuse to allow other people who could and would do it to do so? How could that possibly be defended? Why did the Government resist the inevitable conclusion that the denominational authorities ought and must be allowed to make themselves responsible for investigations as to whether the student was qualified, and afterwards, when he had been admitted to the College, to give him that instruction in religion which was necessary to the due performance of his work hereafter? He had tried to state the case again because it was part of his duty, as it were, to sum up the debate, and it now remained for the Government to give some answer to the argument. No answer had yet been given. They were perfectly willing to meet the Nonconformist grievance, and they had always shown themselves perfectly willing to meet it by the method of the hostels. Where there was a training college, either denominational or undenominational in character, it should be permitted to establish around it hostels either denominational or undenominational, as the case might be, to give that variety of religious training which was necessary in order to be fair to every religious persuasion in the community. That seemed to be a perfectly fair offer. It was a perfectly sound solution of the difficulty. Why would the Government do their best to interefere with it? Why did they lay it down that no future hostel on such lines was to be permitted? It passed the wit of man to understand how the Government could defend such a course as that. The Government perhaps, thought that by yielding to Nonconformist pressure in this matter they were out of their difficulties. Let them be at once undeceived. They had probably already realised, after listening to that debate, that that is only the letting out of the waters—that it was only the beginning of trouble.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: Hear, hear.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said it was precisely in the quarter from which he heard that cheer that the storm was likely in the first instance to arise. The noble Duke spoke for a body of men who were never afraid of their convictions, and he had told their Lordships in perfectly courteous language, but in perfectly distinct language, that if these regulations were enforced the Catholic body were determined to defy the law. What were they going to do then?

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK: I should disregard the regulations.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said the noble Duke's language was always moderate, but his conclusions were always very firm. When the noble Duke treated the regulations in the way he had described, what were the Government going to do? Were they going to shut up all the Roman Catholic training colleges? Were they really going to do that? Of course not. They would no more dare to shut up all the Roman Catholic training colleges than they would fly. No, no; the main motive in the Government's action in these matters was not courage. He need not be more precise as to what the particular quality was that generally governed them in matters of this kind. Undoubtedly the Roman Catholic colleges would not be shut up. Some device would be found, some method, some arrangement would be come to, and the example of the Roman Catholics might be catching. He would not be surprised. Let the Government, then, consider before they committed themselves too far. Let them realise that to oppress the conscience of the people never had succeeded, and never would succeed, in this country, and, whether it was some petty tyranny towards some Church school in a Midland town, or whether it concerned some training college, they would find that convictions were hard to deal with, and, while there was time, let them think better of it, and have respect for the religious convictions and consciences of the people of the country.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): Before I enter upon the various points, some of principle and some of detail, which various speakers have touched in this debate, I deem it my duty in the first place to explain the reasons which induced me just now not to rise before the noble Marquess, because he has made some complaint that nobody rose to reply to him before he closed the debate. [Murmurs of dissent.] Yes, he claimed the right to close the debate. I have only very recently had the honour of becoming a Member of your Lordships' House and, therefore, I have no claim whatever to address your Lordships upon a question of procedure and practice; but I am informed by those who sit near me and have had a very long experience of this House—and quite as long an experience as the noble Marquess—that, in the days of the late Government it was the invariable practice of that Government to claim the right of reply in a debate of this kind. Of course, I would desire to add that I regret that the task of closing the debate on the Government side of the House should not have fallen to one who has a greater claim than I have perhaps to address your Lordships, as I only hold a subordinate post in His Majesty's Government; but in matters of this kind those are called upon to speak whom their Leaders desire should speak, and as the task has been deputed to me for better or for worse to say what is to be said on behalf of the Government at the closing stage of this debate, I hope I shall not be prejudiced in your hearing merely because I did not just now rise before the noble Marquess.

It is always the fortune of the Liberal Party in either House of Parliament in an education debate to hear hard things said of themselves, and this debate has been no exception. At a very early stage of the debate the noble Marquess who introduced the subject, and who is not adverse to the use of metaphorical language, accused the Government of having armed themselves with the sword in order to trample the people of this country under foot.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I am sorry to interrupt, but I was merely quoting the words of Mr. McKenna when I used the word "sword."

*LORD FITZMAURICE: I only wish to observe, expressing an individual opinion of my own, I am not in the least objecting to the noble Marquess's metaphor; but if I had a desire, which I have not, to trample the liberties of the people under foot, I think I should not have selected the sword with that particular object. That being so, I was rather relieved that the noble Duke who spoke with almost equal indignation did not himself adopt some metaphor to crush the Liberal Party, because, I remember that some years ago I was travelling in Italy, and I read an Encyclical from a very great and worthy man with strong convictions, Pope Pius IX., which was directed against the Liberal Party in Italy on the question of education; he compared the Liberal Party in various ways to many things, and finally he said, alluding to them—

> "That a viper had come out of the sea, and threatened to swallow St. Peter's barque."

I was rather relieved that the noble Duke did not use that metaphor against my noble friends and myself, all the more so that as his speech proceeded it became perfectly clear to me that, although he said nothing about the barque, he had a perfectly clear opinion that we were a set of vipers.

This debate, my Lords, has ranged over three topics. The noble Marquess just now, rather to my astonishment, returned to the question of the sum of £100,000. I had rather hoped, after what had fallen from the noble Lord who sits on the Woolsack, that the consciences of noble Lords opposite might have been quieted, but that appears not to have been the case. I can only say for myself that it strikes me as a very extraordinary thing that the members of the Government, whether in this House or in the other, should have been called upon to prove what, I thought, was a universally accepted proposition, namely, that in every country there must be somewhere a supreme legislative power, and that in this country it resides in Parliament, and that where finance is concerned the real responsibility is not here but in the House of Commons. We do not require to bring down from our shelves the dusty volumes of Blackstone and Delolme, or the more modern volumes of Professor Dicey and Sir William Anson to prove that. These are things which we were taught in our schools of jurisprudence in our early days, and when I am told that Mr Speaker—and I as an old member of the House of Commons desire to express the greatest respect for every word that falls from his lips—said, as is alleged, that the House of Commons could disobey the law, he was simply stating the fact that although there may be an Act on the Statute-book, the House of Commons, by a Bill or Resolution in Supply, can lay the foundations of a change, which afterwards can be incorporated in an Act of Parliament. In so saying it appears to me that Mr. Speaker was only uttering what, I may almost venture to say, without any disrespect to his high office, is a platitude, which I should have thought everybody knew by this time.

Upon the constitutional aspect of this question I wish here to be allowed to say a very few words. As was said by the noble Lord, Lord Ashbourne, whether a question is a grave matter of the Constitution or not depends very much upon the size, importance, and magnitude of the legislative act or other act which is proposed, and he argued, evidently with perfect sincerity, that this was a tremendous new departure, and that we were doing something by this temporary Act of Parliament which constituted a grave and permanent infringement of the Constitution of the country. Now, my Lords, I cannot help thinking, and I say so with great respect, that if Lord Ashbourne had been as familiar with the working of English administration and of the English Education Acts as he undoubtedly is with the working of things in Ireland, he would not have committed himself to so rash a proposition, because, as a matter of fact, all that this change purports to do and can accomplish is to give effect to a very humble clause of the Act of 1902, for which we are not responsible, but for which noble Lords opposite are responsible. I claim that here we are really upon common ground with noble Lords opposite, and that this has a very great bearing upon constitutional questions, because clearly if it can be shown that some particular act or set of acts are really done upon common ground, and that the forms of the Constitution are not being used to override the views of one Party by the other, it is very difficult indeed in a case of that kind to support an indictment of anybody for unconstitutional action.

Now, what is this proposal? In the Act of 1902 there was a clause to which Mr. Balfour attached the greatest importance, as doing justice to the Nonconformist views upon this subject. He believed, and no doubt quite sincerely, that the ninth clause in the Act of 1902 would be of very great value to the Nonconformists. What was that clause? It was a clause under which even where there was a complete supply of school places in the district, and the borough council or county council would therefore be under no obligation to supply another school or school places, nevertheless, in order to do justice to the claims of an educational minority, presumably a Roman Catholic or a Nonconformist minority, it was to be within the power of the county council to set up another school, in most cases, no doubt, a rather small school, in order to meet the views of that religious minority. Mr. Balfour, as I have said, no doubt spoke with perfect sincerity when he said that that clause would be used in practice, and would be of very great value. As a matter of fact, that clause has never proved of the smallest value, because there are conditions attached to its working which majorities have always been able to defeat. Sometimes the cry has been raised that the minority is not a sufficient minority, and other reasons have been given; but the great obstacle has been that the clause says that with regard to the working of it regard is to be had to the interests of economy, and the ratepayer has invariably come forward to say that on the ground of economy he objects to it. Now, what this clause will do is to give some chance to Mr. Balfour's clause. ["No, no!"] It is all very well to say "No, no," but perhaps the noble Lord will allow me to conclude my argument. This clause of ours will give some chance, perhaps not a very large one, to Mr. Balfour's clause to become a reality, because when a small school of that kind is asked for by a Roman Catholic or Nonconformist majority, or it might be a Church majority—although I admit that is not likely—it will then be possible for the ratepayers to apply to the Board of Education to ease the burden of the ratepayer. These are the only cases in which this money can be used. I think the noble Lord opposite who said "No, no!" is probably under the common and mistaken apprehension that this money is to be used in a general way by the county council to build new schools wherever it desires to do so. That is not the case. The Lord President has already explained this, and I wish to say it again, that this money is not to be used to ease off the burdens of the county councils in any case where they have a statutory obligation to supply a new school—that is to say, where the population may have increased and new school places may be required, but only in the cases which I have described. I now pass to what I quite admit are larger and more controversial issues. There is, I know, an idea, and not at all an unnatural idea—it was propagated in the first few days after these regulations came out—that this was an attempt to sweep completely out of existence all secondary schools which are not entirely managed by the representatives of local bodies. That is not the case. I hope that by this time it is fairly generally understood that what is provided for is that there is to be a majority on these bodies of the representatives of public bodies, and the reason why the Board of Education has come forward with these proposals—I shall state it quite frankly, and without any desire to make any concealment about it—is the desire to prevent in regard to secondary education that state of things growing up such as has been, and still is, such a terrible obstacle to the solution of the public elementary education question—I mean a monopoly of secondary education growing up in the hands of some particular religious body. They do not in the least desire to exclude any religious body. It is desired to prevent a monopoly of power becoming gradually vested, owing to the superior wealth, power, and influence, in some one denomination in secondary education, such as we tried to remedy last year, although we failed, in regard to elementary education. But, on the other hand, the Government equally desire to invite, and to have the co-operation of those men, to whatever religion or denomination they belong—and many of the noblest of them have been amongst members of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic body—who are anxious to promote education for the sake of education. My Lords, I listened with all that regard which I feel, and which every Member of your Lordships' House feels, to the right rev. Prelate the Bishop of Salisbury, and I listened to him with peculiar respect because he is the Bishop of my diocese. He spoke of a school with which he is connected and with the fortunes of which I have in a way been connected, because in those negotiations to which he alluded and which he took as typical of the injustice which he said might occur, he and I were both concerned. But I think I can remind the right rev. Prelate that in this scheme which we have before us there are clauses specially inserted, although some noble Lords seem to have entirely overlooked them, to meet the class of case which he described, and although I know nothing is so rash as prophecy even in regard to the associations of those with whom one is connected politically or locally, I would not be very much afraid to prophesy that that which has been inserted in Clause 43 to meet the case of schools of this kind, will be used by the county council of which at one time I was chairman, and as chairman of which I negotiated with the right rev. Prelate in regard to that school. I am quite aware that the success of those negotiations was mainly due to the conciliatory spirit of the right rev. Prelate, and he would grant, as he has publicly acknowledged, that he was met in a very willing spirit by the county council which at the time had a Liberal majority. If what I know from my own experience is possible in regard to a school in my own county, why am I to believe it is impossible everywhere else? Why are we to assume that everybody is to act in an unreasonable spirit? I, on the contrary, have arrived at the pleasant conclusion that, on the whole, in these matters there is a spirit of reason, and that Englishmen generally—I do not mind to what body they belong—when they meet together round a table to discuss this kind of question as practical men in local administration, find the difficulties which loom so large in the House of Commons and here, very largely disappear.

What will be the general view of the secondary education of a county when these regulations come into force? What will happen when the regulations have been at work for a certain number of years? It is, I think, tolerably easy to say that the majority of the schools would be schools with a large representative element upon them, but many of them will, no doubt, also have a very considerable minority representing the older interests of the founders, some dating from a remote past, and some, as in the case of the Bishop's School at Salisbury, of a more recent date. Then there would be some schools which I daresay will have a distinctly denominational character and which will be brought in by way of exception. These last-named schools, no doubt, will have generous treatment under Section 43 passed with that object and to which I ask your Lordships' attention, because I think it has not received sufficient attention in these debates. Lastly there would be the schools, which so far as I know have not been mentioned in this debate, which will come into being—some have come already into being—under Chapter 8, that is to say, those schools which would not be receiving grants at all from the Government, and, perhaps, not even from the county council, because they will be charging possibly very high fees, and these regulations deal chiefly with schools with comparatively low fees. They will probably be schools of a more directly denominational character; because some of the religious bodies will desire to keep up schools of this kind. Nevertheless, as Chapter 8 shows, they will all count towards the educational supply of the county, and there is nothing in these regulations, so far as I am aware, to prevent county councils doing what is done now in regard to schools of this kind. They may not subsidise them directly, and the schools will receive no Government grant, but, nevertheless, scholarships are allowed to be held at the schools, and in that way they are brought in a very clear and direct manner within the purview of a county scheme. I will go back to the illustration of the school of the right rev. Prelate. Even if the Wiltshire County Council and the Government had never paid the school one shilling in grants, as both have done, there would have been nothing whatever to prevent the Wiltshire County Council saying that scholarships should be held at that school. There is the case of a Wesleyan school in the county to which the county council has always refused a grant for varied reasons. That school has, however, always been allowed to hold our county council scholarships, and in that way we have obtained a hold on it. Therefore, I say, there would be three classes of schools. If anyone wants a denominational school there will be the denominational schools, which I have described, under Chapter 8, no doubt not receiving a grant, but open to the public inasmuch as county council scholarships may be held there; there will be the schools under purely public management; and there will be the schools where there will only be a majority of public managers. I ask the noble Lord himself, does he see anything illiberal or unjust in the plan I have described? I cannot help thinking that if he does, he will find it hard to carry the same conviction to the minds of the great majority of the people of this country.

Now I come to that part of the question which I admit has attracted most attention this evening. I mean the training colleges. Here again

I am obliged to pursue what may be called a rather minimising line of argument. This is necessary because there has really been all through this debate a note of alarm and exaggeration which I think upon calmer reflection many noble Lords and right rev. Prelates will say has hardly been justified. If anybody had come into this debate as a listener, unaware of the main facts, and had simply tried to pick them up, while the discussion went along, he would, I am convinced, have gone away, if he had listened only to right rev. Prelates and to noble Lords opposite, with the belief that His Majesty's Government had issued a sort of *ukase* giving a date when all denominational training colleges in the country should be closed. But nothing of the kind has happened. All that has been done in regard to the existing colleges is to establish a conscience clause, such as has already been established in so many other educational institutions in the country. When we come to analyse carefully the able speech of the most rev. Prelate, what really does it come to? It reduces itself really to a very considerable number of criticisms of detail which my noble friend, Lord Stanley of Alderley, who speaks with so much knowledge and authority on this subject, has pointed out were matters which might fairly be described as arising rather at the Committee stage if we were on a Bill.

EARL CAWDOR: But we are not.

*LORD FITZMAURICE: They were matters, therefore, capable, after discussion, of adjustment, and possibly in some cases of improvement.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Will His Majesty's Government provide a Committee stage to enable us to discuss these matters?

*LORD FITZMAURICE: It is not, I would remind you, in my power to alter the forms of your Lordships' House. I was only pursuing the analogy of the speech of Lord Stanley of Alderley for which the noble Lord opposite has expressed such admiration. It has always been the practice when regulations in regard to education, whether elementary or secondary, have had to be considered to take the discussion of them as a whole. No doubt from time to time alterations of detail are introduced and points of practice are cleared up. I quite sympathise with what we have been told about the feelings of the heads of some training colleges in being called upon at rather short notice to administer a system not entirely new, but new in some important respects. I quite sympathise also with the governors and managers of those training colleges. But what I would venture to ask them is: Are they really in a more difficult position at this moment of transition—and I admit that it is a moment of transition, attended necessarily with some difficulties—than any other public body which is called upon to administer a new and important Act of Parliament? Let me give your Lordships an illustration. Are they for example in a more difficult position than county councils were when they found themselves suddenly, in the early days of 1903, called upon to take up an entirely new duty—to administer one of the worst drawn Acts of Parliament which has ever been placed on the Statute Book of this country—the Education Act of 1902? Again, I would ask, are they in a more difficult position than Courts of Quarter Sessions when in the following year—that is to say in 1904—they were called upon suddenly to undertake the administration of a new, though I admit a far more carefully drawn, Act on licensing? They are not, I am convinced, in a more difficult position. They are simply having those troubles which every person who undertakes to carry out legislation is compelled sooner or later to face. The task of taking over the work which I have described was an overwhelming task, which in many cases broke down the health as well as the patience of those who had to do it. *Solvitur ambulando* was the answer given to those who complained. As Lord Stanley of Alderley said, these points of detail which loom so large at the present moment will gradually settle themselves.

Far be it from me to say, however, that there is nothing in connection with these matters which cannot be slightly improved or possibly explained. My right hon. friend Mr. McKenna pointed out when he received a deputation the other day that nothing will be required for several months to come except to purchase a register and have it in the hands of the wardens of the colleges on the 1st of August this year. He stated that no active steps would be taken until after the next examination, which I believe he said would not be until the beginning of December or January. It means, therefore, that the governors of these schools have a period of very nearly five months, if not more, to deal with all these questions. Accordingly, I venture in a spirit of perfect sympathy to say to them, "You have simply got to cope with those difficulties which invariably arise when you are dealing with what in an Act of Parliament are called transitory provisions." I know from my own experience that those provisions which often run through Parliament in a short time—sometimes with almost alarming rapidity—often excite little interest in the minds of Members. Every man, however, who is concerned with local administration is aware that those are the clauses which the local administrators look at with the greatest anxiety. I know that there are what may be called transitory provisions here; therefore, I say it is not unnatural that some complaint should be made and some anxiety expressed. But I would also venture to say that right reverend Prelates may have perfect confidence that those gentlemen of great experience and ability who are at the head of the training colleges will be well able to deal with the difficulties, and that they will not find them the terrific obstacles in their path which they imagine. And here, my Lords, I would have terminated the observations I have ventured at this late hour to make to you, had it not been for one particular question which I think I ought to answer before I sit down. I refer to the point that was raised, I think by the most reverend Prelate, in regard to the use of the words "for the present" in Subhead K, on page 4, of the definitions and conditions. He seemed to draw the conclusion that because those words had, as he said, been suddenly inserted there was some intention to take steps in regard to women day students, depriving them of rights and liberties which he considered it was very desirable to keep up. I understood that he was specifically alluding to the idea that it was the intention of the Board of Education to deprive these lady students of those payments made either to them or on their behalf which would practically enable them to continue their studies by living in lodgings and receiving a grant and at the same time taking the lodging grant into the funds of a denominational hostel. In the first place I understand that the most rev. or right rev. Prelate, whichever it was, is mistaken in imagining that those words "for the present" are in any way a new insertion. I understand that they are a survival from the previous rules and regulations, and the reason they have been put in is one with which I think the right rev. Prelate will himself sympathise. The Board of Education, I am informed, consider that on the whole it is far better that these lady students should live with their parents or other relatives, if they have any, in the town where the training college is situated, and that failing them they should go into a hostel. These words were put in to show that the arrangement of going into lodgings must be a temporary one and was not the final solution of the question, or at any rate the solution the Board of Education looked on with the most favour. The words have nothing to do with any dark or villainous scheme, such as was adumbrated, on the part of the Government or the Board of Education, to deprive the hostels by an indirect blow of those grants which they now receive, if not in a direct at least in an indirect manner.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Lord, but I must point out that the most reverend or right reverend Prelate to whom he refers was Lord Stanley of Alderley.

*LORD FITZMAURICE: I think the most reverend Prelate is mistaken; but I do not bring up the point in a controversial spirit. I have not claimed at all that Lord Stanley of Alderley supported the whole of these regulations, and I was bringing forward arguments on the merits of the proposals. It is quite unimportant for the purposes of my argument whether the criticism was made by Lord Stanley of Alderley or by the right reverend Prelate. All I am anxious to do is to relieve the apprehension by whomsoever it is felt. I know from personal conversations I have had that the regulation does excite considerable apprehension in the minds of those who represent the Church of England in these debates, and therefore I am anxious to take this opportunity of relieving the minds of right reverend Prelates on the subject. I can assure your Lordships that I am anxious to find grounds of agreement where I can, being conscious that there are unfortunately plenty of grounds of disagreement. I have only now to thank your Lordships for having listened to these rather prolonged observations. There have been undoubtedly many other incidental points raised, but I do not think it is necessary or desirable that I should plunge into a great number of them. Some of those points were, I thought, raised rather unnecessarily by the noble Lord, and partook a little of a form of argument of which I am not very fond myself, namely, trying to make out what may be called a series of *tu quoque* cases on some points. I desire to take these regulations as representing a larger educational policy. What I have been anxious to do—even if I have not succeeded—was to convince noble Lords opposite that these regulations represent a large and broad scheme. I have also desired to show that this is not a scheme intended to promote Nonconformity at the expense of the Church or of the nation. What we on this side of the House desire is national education, and, as last year, we absolutely decline to regard the whole of the education of this country as merely a set of petty quarrels between Nonconformity and the Church.

The Duke of NORFOLK: I must crave for an answer to the question which I asked. That question is: Are we to understand that the children of a denomination which has provided a college especially for them are to be shut out in order to make room for students of another denomination which has not provided a college, and which has every opportunity of having a college provided out of the public funds?

***Lord FITZMAURICE**: That is an argumentative question founded on Subsection (*d*). That point was fully gone into by my noble friend the Lord President of the Council. It was fully gone into by the Prime Minister and Mr. McKenna last Saturday, and also, I believe, to-day at a deputation at which the noble Duke himself was present. Under these circumstances I cannot imagine that any further interpretation that I can place on those words or on the explanations which have been given by Cabinet Ministers would do more to satisfy the noble Duke than anything he has already heard.

The Duke of NORFOLK: I am very sorry to hear it.

MESSAGE FROM THE KING.

The Earl of CREWE: I beg to say that His Majesty's gracious Message with respect to Lord Cromer will be taken into consideration by the House on Tuesday next, and that it will have precedence of other Orders of the day. I am happy to be able to put down the Motion in the name of my noble friend, the Leader of the House, who I hope will be in his place on that day.

House adjourned a quarter before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 25*th July*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Tees Conservancy (re-committed) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Monday next.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with

Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Reported without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Midland Railway Bill [Lords]; Portishead District Water Bill [Lords]; National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.

Petition from Chorlton-cum-Hardy, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table.

PURITY OF MILK SUPPLIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Reading, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL.

Petition from Cottesmore, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.

Petition from Ware and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, 2nd July, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3869 to 3871 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Astronomer-Royal to the Board of Visitors of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COASTGUARD STATIONS (CLOSED).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd July; *Major Seely*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 268.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report, No. 529 (Gibraltar, Report for 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, ETC., 1906–7.

Return ordered, "Of the amount received during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, in respect of each administrative county and county borough in England and Wales, for Local Taxation Licence Duties and Penalties and Forfeitures recovered in respect of such duties, and for other Duties and Payments which are directed to be dealt with in the same manner as the Local Taxation Licence Duties (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 316, of Session 1906)."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

FORESHORES (SALES, ETC).

Copy ordered, "Of Statement of the Particulars of all Cases in which the rights and interests of the Crown in the shores and bed of the sea and tidal rivers have been sold, leased, or otherwise dealt with by the Board of Trade under the Crown Lands Act, 1866, from the 1st day of January, 1902, to the 31st day of December, 1906 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 259, of Session 1902)."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

AUSTRALIA (BRITISH TRADE).

Copy presented, of Report upon the Conditions and Prospects of British Trade in Australia by the Advisory Committee on Commercial Intelligence of the Board of Trade [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of List of Public Elementary Schools and Certified Efficient Schools in Wales and Monmouthshire on 1st August, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Private Burial Grounds.

MR. H. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any record is kept of the permissions granted to use private burial grounds in connection with religious institutions; and, if so, how many such permissions have been granted during the past five years.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) A record is kept of these cases. Permission was given in seven cases during the five years ended on 31st December last.

County Councillor's Expenses.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether instructions are given by the Board to their auditors to allow or to surcharge payment by a county council of the reasonable travelling expenses of the members of the council when engaged in the business of the council, or payment by any other local authority, whose accounts are subject to the audit of the Board, of the reasonable travelling expenses of members of the authority when engaged in the business of the authority.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) No instructions have been given by the Local Government Board to the district auditor on this subject. I am, however, advised that, looking to the decision of the High Court in the case of Rex *v.* Dolby, a local authority are in general not empowered to pay the travelling expenses of members of their body when engaged on the ordinary business of the authority within the district. This view would apply to county councils as well as to other local authorities.

Southern Hospital, Carshalton.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that a hospital called the Southern Hospital has been erected near Carshalton, in Surrey, by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, that the hospital was finished at the end of 1906, at a cost of more than £180,000 for expenses of erection, and that it is standing entirely unused at considerable expense of maintenance and danger of deterioration; whether there are any medical purposes to which it could be applied for the alleviation of infectious diseases; and, if so, whether he will direct the Metropolitan Asylums Board to find some use for this institution.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am aware that the managers have erected this hospital for fever cases and that it is not at present used for that purpose. The question of its use for other purposes has not been lost sight of, either by the managers or by the Local Government Board, and will be again considered as soon as circumstances permit; but until the existing prevalence of fever has abated it is thought desirable that the accommodation afforded by this hospital should be held in reserve. Meanwhile I am assured that the managers are carefully maintaining the building in proper order and repair. I shall continue to give attention to the matter.

Broughton School, Hampshire.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that in the case of the Broughton boys' school, Hampshire, the staff consists of a certificated teacher and a monitor, possessing no qualification under the code, who has been refused recognition as a supplementary teacher; and whether the Board will recommend that to this school, containing on the average about forty scholars, who have to be taught in several classes or standards, an additional teacher, possessing qualifications for the work, shall be appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I do not think that this is a case in which I could insist on the appointment of an additional qualified teacher, especially as the school supply of the district is now under consideration by the local authority, who have announced their intention of providing a new council school.

Cottars Rents in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state what steps he proposes to take to secure titles with fair rents for the cottars in the island of Lewis, some 1,500, who have built substantial stone houses on the crofters' common grazing.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) On the general question of land tenure I can only refer my hon. friend to the terms of the Bill now in Committee, which represents the policy of the Government.

Scottish Education Grants.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state what was the amount received during the financial year ending 31st March, 1907, in respect of each of the five sums referred to in the five paragraphs of subsection (1) of Clause 12 of the Education (Scotland) Bill; and what was the total credit balance, if any, remaining in respect of each of these sums at the close of that financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The amounts in question were—

	£	s.	d.
Subsection (1) - -	40,000	0	0
Subsection (2) - -	59,163	9	5
Subsection (3) - -	60,000	0	0
Subsection (4) - -	37,977	12	1
Subsection (5) - -	37,937	19	11

The sums under (1) and (4) were paid into the Fee Grant Account. The credit balance of the Fee Grant Account at 31st March, 1907, was £113,530, 18s. 7d. The sums under (3) and (5) are paid partly into the Higher Inspection Account and partly into the Secondary Education Account. The credit balances of these accounts at 31st March, 1907, were—

	£	s.	d.
Higher Inspection Account	1,648	10	0
Secondary Education Account - - -	24,026	6	9

Navy Contracts for Clothing.

MR. WATT (Glasgow College): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what was the value of contracts for clothing of the Navy during the last financial year which were placed in England.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The approximate value of contracts for clothing materials, etc., placed in England during the last financial year was £190,000.

Outrages in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give the designations of the outrages recorded as agrarian in which firearms were used during the three months ended 31st March, 30th June, 30th September, and 31st December, 1906, and the past two quarters of the present year, distinguishing the counties and districts in which such outrages were committed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The particulars asked for are given in the subjoined table—

Counties.	Districts.	March Quarter, 1906.			June Quarter, 1906.			Sept. Quarter, 1906.			Dec. Quarter, 1906.			March Quarter, 1907.				June Quarter, 1907.		
		Firing at the person.	Firing into dwelling.	Intimidation.	Firing at the person.	Firing into dwelling.	Intimidation.	Firing at the person.	Firing into dwelling.	Intimidation.	Firing at the person.	Firing into dwelling.	Intimidation.	Firing at the person.	Firing into dwelling.	Intimidation.	Killing cattle.	Firing at the person.	Firing into dwelling.	Intimidation.
King's - -	Banagher - - -	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Galway, East Riding	Athenry and Loughrea	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	1	—	3	1	—	—	9	1
Galway, West Riding	Gort and Galway -	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	3	1	—	—	3	—
Sligo - - -	Easkey - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Clare - - -	Ballyvaughan, Corofin, Kilrush, and Sixmile-bridge - - -	—	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	1	—	2	3	1
Cork, East Riding	Kanturk and Midleton	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cork, West Riding	Millstreet - - -	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kerry - - -	Castleisland, Listowel, and Tralee - -	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	—
Limerick - -	Abbeyfeale - -	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tipperary, South Riding	Killenaule - - -	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		7			4			6			5			13				22		

Opium Houses in Shanghai.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information to the effect that 700 opium houses in the native city of Shanghai had been closed, but that similar houses in the Foreign settlements to the number of 1,920 remain open; and, if so, will he say what is the ground of the distinction; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the negative. According to the latest information received, discussions are still proceeding among the Chinese authorities as to the practical steps that should be taken in the native city; and meanwhile no action is being taken in the Foreign settlements. The Foreign municipal authorities have, however, stated their intention to support to the full extent of their power any practical measures that may be taken by the Chinese authorities. I have asked to be kept informed of any progress in the matter.

Northern Lights Commissioners.

MR. J. D. WHITE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, how many portions of land have been acquired for lighthouse and similar purposes by the Northern Lights Commissioners since 1890, stating as regards each case the year of purchase; the locality, character, and approximate area of the purchased portion; the amount, if any, which was paid for it, and to whom such payment was made; and the annual valuation for rating of the purchased portion at the time of the purchase or, if that portion formed part of a larger rating unit, the amount by which the annual rating valuation of that unit was reduced in consequence of the exclusion of the purchased portion.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am informed by the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses that the number of portions of land acquired by them for lighthouse and similar purposes since 1890 is fifty-nine. The Commissioners' property is exempted from rates under Section 731 of The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, and they have no information regarding the rating values of these lands at the time of acquisition. The other particulars desired by my hon. friend are too voluminous to be given here, but I will send him the statement which has been furnished me by the Commissioners on the subject.

Railway Rates at Cookstown.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether the Great Northern Railway Company give secret rebates and free cartage which are not shown on the rate-books of the company, to certain traders in Cookstown, county Tyrone, and other stations; and, if so, will he cause inquiries to be made and steps taken to put a stop to a practice which gives the traders in question an unjust preference over other traders in Cookstown and elsewhere.

(*Answerd by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Complaint has been made to the Board of Trade that secret rebates are given by the railway company on certain traffic at Cookstown, and that some goods are carted free of charge. The railway company deny that this is the case, and as the complainants do not wish their names to appear in the matter the Board have not been able to carry it further. The statements made to the Board have, however, been forwarded to the Vice-regal Commission on Irish Railways, by whom the matter is now being considered.

Belfast Outworkers.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that about 50 per cent. of the out-workers in Belfast do not come within the scope of the Factory and Workshop Act; and what action, if any, does he propose to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have no figures showing what proportion of the out-workers in Belfast are not covered by the Home Work Order at present in force, but attention has been called to the fact that there are a considerable number engaged in the household linen trade, a trade not included in that Order, and I am now considering the question of including that, with some other trades, in a further Order.

Cloughfin Letter Deliveries.

MR. KETTLE: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that in the district of Cloughfin, county Tyrone, there are only four deliveries in the week from Stewartstown post office; that the English mail reaching Stewartstown on Monday or Wednesday lies at the post office for two days undelivered; and, having regard to the inconvenience caused to the seventy-four householders in the Cloughfin district, will he direct that daily delivery be made in the future.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject; and on its receipt I will communicate with the hon. Member.

National Telephone Agreements.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether agreements made for twelve months, with payment in advance, between the National Telephone Company and their renters are now chargeable with an *ad valorem* stamp duty; and, if so, on what grounds a charge is made in these cases, which is not made in the case of other annual contracts where payment is made in advance.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The agreements in question have been declared by the House of Lords to be chargeable with *ad valorem* duty under the head "Bond, Covenant, etc.," in the Schedule to The Stamp Act, 1891. No distinction is made between these agreements and others of a similar nature.

Corn Duty.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the probable cost of collecting the estimated net revenue of £1,067,265, collected upon wheat and wheat flour imported into the United Kingdom from foreign countries between 15th April, 1902, and 30th June.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The net revenue referred to in the Question (which, as stated in the corrected reply circulated with to-day's Votes, was £1,167,265, not £1,067,265) was collected in conjunction with other Customs duties as a whole, and it is impossible to say what proportion of the total expenditure of the Customs Department should be regarded as attributable to that particular duty.

Indian Tea.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the figures showing how much Indian tea was imported annually into Russia before the imposition of retaliatory duties upon Indian tea by the Russian Government in consequence of the action of His Majesty's Government with regard to Russian sugar, and how much Indian tea has been annually imported since; whether Indian tea imported into Russia *via* Manchuria was exempted from these retaliatory duties; and how much Indian tea has passed into Russia *via* Manchuria, and how much by other routes.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The imports of Indian tea into Russia by all routes, before and since the imposition of the surtax in September, 1903, have been as follows:—

	Calendar Years.				
	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Direct from India -	4,002,448	3,904,719	8,778,634	10,796,940	12,278,524
Re-exported from the United Kingdom - - -	2,886,445	3,079,514	3,567,419	2,877,885	8,249,985
TOTAL - -	6,888,893	6,984,233	12,346,053	13,674,825	20,528,509

The surtax was applied only to tea imported by the Black Sea or European frontiers. The trade Returns do not give the information asked for in the last part of the Question.

Judicial Floggings in India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has passed orders on the Report received from the Government of India regarding the prevalence and character of judicial floggings in India; and, if so, whether there is any objection to laying Papers on the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Report is still under my consideration in Council.

Calcutta Opium Sales.

SIR H. COTTON: To ask the Secretary of State for India what has been the average price of opium at the Calcutta sales, month by month, since January last; and what is the average price estimated in the Budget for the current year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The average price per chest of opium at the Calcutta monthly sales since January 1907 has been as follows:—

	Rs.	a.	p.
January - - - -	1,373	1	1
February - - - -	1,364	4	5
March - - - - -	1,511	8	8
April - - - - -	1,456	10	4
May - - - - -	1,411	9	4
June - - - - -	1,427	8	1

The average price estimated in the Budget for 1907–8 was Rs. 1,250.

Special Police Protection in Ireland.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what proportion of the persons receiving constant police protection, and special protection by patrol throughout Ireland, on 1st January, 1906, and 1st July, 1907, belonged to the class of tenants described as new tenants; whether in the case of new tenants who were afforded such protection the constables employed on duty were extra to the county establishment, a moiety of the expenses of whom would have been, as is usual in such circumstances, defrayed equally from local rates and from the Exchequer; if so, what was the amount payable from each such source in respect of the twelve months ended 31st December, 1906; whether police protection was afforded to new tenants on either of the dates mentioned from stations which are held by the constabulary authorities to form centres for ordinary police duty in the districts in which they are situate, inclusive of the duty of giving special protection to new tenants; what was the number of constables exclusively employed in affording protection to new tenants on these dates; and whether his reports from the police authorities show that if the necessity for giving such protection were removed a corresponding reduction could, with safety, be effected in the general police establishment of the country.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On 1st January, 1906 (1) ten out of the forty-seven persons receiving constant protection, and (2) sixty-one out of the 178 persons receiving patrol protection were new tenants. On 1st July, 1907, the corresponding figures were (1) thirteen and fifty, and (2) forty-seven and 167. The protection of both kinds afforded to new tenants between the dates named was given mainly by police of the county establishments, and twenty-three extra men were employed upon the same duty for periods between those dates. The statutory charge recoverable from local authorities in respect of the employment of such extra men during the year 1906 amounts to about £160, the cost to the State in the first instance being about £460. In seven cases of constant protection on 1st January, 1906, and in eight case on 1st July, 1907, the protection was afforded from permanent police stations, and in all cases of patrol protection the protection was given from such stations. The number of policemen exclusively employed in affording constant protection to new tenants was on 1st January, 1906, twenty-one, and on 1st July, 1907, twenty-seven. It is hoped that the settlement of the question now under the consideration of Parliament will enable a reduction to be made in the general police establishment of the country, not only by releasing the men now employed on protection duty, but also by reason of the generally improved condition of the country which may be expected upon the removal of agrarian troubles. It is not, however, possible at present to estimate what amount of reduction could be effected.

Belfast Tramway Contracts.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the refusal of the Belfast Corporation Tramways Committee to consider the complaint of a deputation from the Ironfounders Society, protesting against a certain firm receiving a certain contract from the committee without complying with the Standing Orders as to a fair wages clause, and also protesting against the sub-letting of contracts and against contractors doing work by apprentice labour; and whether he will take steps to insist that the provisions of the Belfast Tramways Act are complied with in respect of these matters.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The minutes of the Tramways Committee of the Belfast Corporation for 10th June show that a deputation from the Ironfounders Society attended and alleged that certain contractors were not complying with the conditions of the contract, seeing that they had sub-let the casting of brake-blocks to a firm which employed apprentices instead of journeymen. The committee were informed by the general manager that, so far as he was aware, there had been no sub-letting, but that inquiries would be made and if there was anything wrong it would be set rght. The Local Government Board have no further information in the matter. They do not know what provisions of the Belfast Tramways Act are alluded to in the concluding part of the Question.

Case of Artilleryman Dunleany.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that James Martin Dunleany, who served for ten years in the Royal Horse Artillery and was discharged so far back as 1872, rejoined at the time of the war in South Africa and served for some three years at the base in the 9th Field Force, commanded by Major Jerome, where he received a fall, injuring the spine of his back, from which he is now permanently incapacitated; and whether, having regard to all the facts, he will now direct that either a pension or some bulk sum be paid to this man to help to maintain him in his helplessness.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) If the hon. Member will be good enough to furnish the War Office with full particulars of this man's service during the South African War (including the name of his regiment, regimental number, and dates of enlistment and discharge), the case shall be inquired into and the result communicated to him.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Terrible."

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty on what date H.M.S. "Terrible" broke her propeller shaft; on what date her repairs were completed and the ship commissioned; and where she has been lying during this period.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The "Terrible" broke one of her propeller shafts on her way back from Hong-Kong on 28th September, 1906. A new shaft and propeller have since been supplied, and repairs of the "Terrible" are in progress at Portsmouth, where she has been lying since her return from China.

Royal Navy Volunteers.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether there is any intention on the part of the Admiralty to disband the Royal Naval Volunteers.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: There is no intention whatever of disbanding the Royal Naval Volunteers, who are an efficient and essential part of the personnel of the Naval Service. In point of fact we have a Bill before Parliament, which I hope the House will pass unanimously, for strengthening their position.

Mr. SMEATON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that rumours had been circulated to the effect that the Royal Naval Volunteers were to be disbanded; and whether if would not be advisable to give equal publicity to the contradiction of the rumour.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am much obliged to my hon. friend for giving me the opportunity of publicly denying one of these mischievous and baseless rumours concerning the Navy and Admiralty which have been circulated.

H.M.S. "Blake."

Mr. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is proposed, and, if so, when, to alter the armament of H.M.S. "Blake."

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: This is the sixth Question on this subject, and I must refer the hon. Member to the reply given by my hon. friend the Civil Lord to the last Question on Monday.†

Fatality to Naval Volunteers on the Tyne.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is yet in a position to state what course the Admiralty have decided to take in respect of the claim for compensation by the relatives of the Naval Volunteers recently drowned in the Tyne while on duty.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The funeral expenses of all four men drowned will be borne by Naval Funds. No claims for compensation on behalf of dependant relatives have been received, except through my hon. friend himself on behalf of the parents of one of the men. This claim is being investigated, but I am not yet in a position to say what the result will be.

Woolwich Arsenal—Reduced Establishment.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the minimum staff has now been fixed for Woolwich Arsenal; and whether he can state the number to the House.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in fixing the minimum strength of the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, consideration has been given to the work allocated for this year; whether the minimum now fixed will mean that 600 more men will be discharged from one department, viz. the Royal Laboratory; and whether this department has sufficient work to keep the present staff fully employed.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): In reply to my hon. friend it has been found possible to fix numbers beyond which the staff of the Royal Laboratory, Royal Gun Factory and Carriage Department will not vary in either direction, except in case of emergency, namely a minimum of 8,000 and a maximum of 8,400. The numbers employed in these Departments on July 22nd were 9,166 and it will be necessary to reduce this number by 456 during the present financial year. After this it is believed that the number will be brought within the limits fixed, by the natural wastage of the following year. These figures do not include the 3,145 men now employed in the Torpedo Factory, Building Works Department or Central Offices, for which no minimum establishment is at present fixed, and in which no special discharges or reduction are at present contemplated. These figures bring the total at Woolwich to 12,311. Of these a few in the Building Works Department and Central Office are employed at Enfield and Waltham. The new limits fixed for Enfield are 1,900 to 2,000 and for Waltham 600 to 650. It is proposed to reduce numbers at Enfield by 48 this year, which will bring it within the limit, and at Waltham by 35, which will bring the numbers there to 700 and leave fifty for reduction by wastage next year. In regard to the second Question of the hon. Member I have to say that, in fixing the minimum, full consideration has been given to all the circumstances as regards work for this year and the future. The minimum fixed for the Royal Laboratory, 4,300 to 4,500, will entail an ultimate reduction in this department of 871. Of this number 371 will be by discharge before the end of the financial year (a figure included in the number of 456 given in reply to the hon. Member's previous Question), and the remainder by wastage next year or transfer to the other factories. The work available this year for the Royal Laboratory might possibly suffice to keep the present staff continuously employed till later in the year, but it is desirable to proceed with these reductions continuously in order to arrive at the minimum establishment and continuity of employment at the earliest date possible, and avoid, if possible, discharges during the coming winter or in the course of next year.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1156–7.

MR. CROOKS: May I ask whether any work which the men of Woolwich are unable to complete will be given out to contract, or retained in the Arsenal, to be finished next year?

MR. BUCHANAN: There is no intention of giving out to contract any work which has not been completed.

Army Contracts.—Bribery.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether, after the infliction of fines upon Messrs. Meyer and Messrs. Stepney for bribery in connection with Army contracts, money was paid over to them without the deduction of the fines; whether the fines have since been paid; and, if not, who was responsible for paying away the security for the liquidation of the fines.

MR. BUCHANAN: My hon. friend evidently refers to matters dealt with in Section 12 of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. An early opportunity will be given to the House of discussing the Report, and I must ask my hon. friend to defer his Question until the debate is reached.

The Militia.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask Secretary of State for War when recruiting for the Militia will cease.

MR. BUCHANAN: Recruiting for the Militia will cease as soon as possible after the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill becomes law, but I cannot at present fix the exact date, of which ample notice will be given.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: Will it be possible to fix the date before the end of the session?

MR. BUCHANAN: I do not think so.

Tidworth Barracks.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether sufficient barrack accommodation exists for the officers of the Scots Greys at Tidworth.

MR. BUCHANAN: Of the officers of the Scots Greys at Tidworth, all with the exception of two who are on the lodging list, are accommodated with quarters. A squadron of the regiment with six officers is quartered at present at Dorchester.

Irish Militia.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state what battalions of Irish Militia it is intended to disband or amalgamate; can he say what the future *status* of officers and men will be; and is he aware that owing to the delay in issuing definite information on these subjects, recruiting is seriously handicapped and great difficulty experienced in obtaining subaltern officers.

MR. BUCHANAN: The hon. and gallant Member will readily understand that the selection of Irish Militia regiments for amalgamation will involve very careful consideration. I do not suppose that I shall be in a position to give any definite information on this matter for some time. As regards the *status* of the officers and men, information was given to the hon. and gallant Member in reply to a Question put by him on the 10th June. †

Soldiers in Civil Employment.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that during the month of May and the early part of June last, a sergeant of the Royal Irish Fusiliers was employed as a checker at the Midland Great Western Railway, North Wall, goods store; and can he say for what purpose the military authorities are placing men belonging to the Army in such occupations on the railway while so many civilians cannot get work.

MR. BUCHANAN: This man arrived home from India on the 29th April, and was as is customary given six weeks furlough pending discharge in order to enable him to seek employment. He obtained such employment as a checker at the North Wall goods store of the Midland South Western Railway.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxv, 1071.

MR. HUDSON: Is it not the case that the man appeared on the North Wall daily in his regimentals and did ordinary civilian work while receiving Army pay?

MR, BUCHANAN: I am not aware. But the man was under notice of discharge and it is customary on return from foreign service to grant a man furlough for six weeks to enable him to look for employment. That is what occurred in this case.

The Indian Rupee.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can give any information to the House in regard to the circulation of the silver coinage of India beyond the borders of that country, whether in countries under our flag or others; and if there is any recognised steady equivalent value of the rupee in relation to the silver coinage of other countries in the East.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The Indian rupee is used in Ceylon and in various parts of East Africa. The net export of rupees by sea in the five years 1901–2 to 1905–6 amounted to Rs. 29,798,586 = £1,986,600, but I am unable to state the number in circulation in the several Colonies and Protectorates. The exchange between India and Singapore which has a gold standard, is practically stationary; but the exchange with China and Hong Kong, which have a silver standard, is subject to variation, due, no doubt, to changes in the price of silver.

Plague Inoculation in the Punjab.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that inoculation for plague in the Punjab of late has been resorted to in increasing numbers of cases and that the death rate from plague is there at the highest, he will take into consideration the expediency of abandoning the practice as dangerous.

MR. MORLEY: The opinion of those who have had experience is that the health of the patients is unimpaired by inoculation even where they are children of poor constitution; and that it confers immunity for a period of from six to twelve months or more. Statistics in Bombay show in the case of municipal labourers that while the percentage of uninoculated who were attacked by plague was 6·7, that of inoculated was only ·19.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON asked how the right hon. Gentleman explained the fact that the death-rate was highest where inoculation was greatest.

MR. MORLEY was understood to reply that it was quite true that the death-rate in the Punjab was extremely high, but he was not sure that it was also true that the inoculation was practised over wide areas where the disease was prevalent.

Repatriation of Chinese Labourers.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now say how many Chinese labourers have applied during this financial year for repatriation under the proclamation of last year.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland, for Mr. CHURCHILL): The number of applications according to the latest information received is 340.

Asiatics in the Transvaal.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can explicitly state to the House what was the nature of the assurances given to the Secretary of State for the Colonies by General Botha with regard to the administration of the Asiatic Law Amendment Act of 1907; and whether those assurances have, or have not, been observed by General Botha, who recently declared in the Transvaal Parliament that none of the disabilities imposed by the Act would be removed.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (for Mr. CHURCHILL): General Botha assured

Lord Elgin that no effort would be spared to make the application and operation of the Act as little irksome as possible, and it was understood that he hoped to be able to provide for the adoption of other methods of registration than finger prints, to which objection has been taken by Indians. The attention of the Secretary of State has been called to certain regulations recently made under the Act by which the system of finger prints is retained. It would, therefore, appear that General Botha did not on furthur inquiry find it practicable to dispense with them, but the Secretary of State will communicate with the Transvaal Government on the subject.

Colonial Tariffs.

MR. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any of the self-governing Colonies charge the Imperial Government or their contractors Customs duties on stores, provisions, equipment, or other articles imported into a self-governing Colony for the use of the Naval and Military Forces of the Crown and paid for by the British taxpayers.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (for Mr. CHURCHILL): Exemptions from duty are granted by all the self-governing Colonies on equipment and various other articles imported for the use of His Majesty's Forces.

Panama Canal Labourers.

MR. STARKEY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many British officials are charged with the duty of inspecting the Trinidad labourers indentured to work upon the Panama Canal, during their absence from the Island of Trinidad.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (for Mr. CHURCHILL): None, Sir; but there is of course a British Consul at Panama.

MR. STARKEY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what are the legal holidays to which Trinidad labourers, working under indenture on the Panama Canal, are entitled.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (for Mr. CHURCHILL): The Secretary of State is not in a position to give the hon. Member the information asked for in the Question.

Colonial Governorships.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in future appointments to governorships of Colonies in which trading is the first consideration, he can see his way by administration to separate the offices of commander-in-chief and minister responsible for the commerce of the Colony, so as to avoid having soldiers looking after matters of which they have no knowledge.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: No, Sir, I am afraid I cannot add to my right hon. friend's reply of the 16th of this month.†

Labour in the Islands of St. Thomé and Principé.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can now say whether any arrangements exist in existing contracts for the repatriation of labourers who leave the mainland to work in the Islands of St. Thomé and Principé; and how many labourers have gone to each island respectively.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I would refer the hon. Member for Gravesend to the Answer given to the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland on the 9th instant, viz., that the existing regulations contain arrangements for the repatriation of the labourers who go to San Thomé and Principé. I have no information as to the respective numbers that go to these two islands.

Freights to Basra.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can now say what, if any, differences in the rates of freights exist in the transport of British and German goods to Basra; and whether the German vessels bearing such goods are also subsidised.

SIR EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Consular Officers at Bagdad and Basra have been instructed to furnish a Report on the subject, but their replies have not yet been received. In a Report on the Trade of Basra for the year 1906, which will very shortly be published, it is stated that the Persian Gulf section of the Hamburg-American Line is, according to the statement of its agent, unsubsidised. The same Report contains particulars as to freights from Basra to United Kingdom and other ports.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 532.

Hague Conference and Disarmament.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether instructions are still being sent from His Majesty's Ministers to the British delegates at the Hague Conference; and can he hold out any expectation that, before the Conference breaks up, the major questions of a permanent court of arbitration and an international reduction of armaments will be strenuously pushed forward for discussion by the representatives of this country.

SIR EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Government are in constant communication with the British delegates on various questions that arise at the Conference. The hon. Member may rest assured that the questions he refers to will continue to receive attention, but the effect given to them must depend upon the general feeling of the Conference, and cannot be decided by the delegates of any one Power acting independently of the rest.

Kaid Sir Harry Maclean.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what terms are demanded by Raisuli for the release of Kaid Sir H. Maclean.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Raisuli has not, as far as I am aware, definitely formulated any terms for the consideration of the Moorish Government. Such reports as have been received of his intentions seem to imply that the nature of his terms will be political.

Lord Cromer.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Lord Cromer was entitled to and has obtained a pension on his retirement; and, if so, what is the amount of this pension, and is it charged on Imperial or Egyptian funds.

SIR EDWARD GREY: A pension of £900 a year has been granted to Lord Cromer from Imperial Funds. This is the pension attached, by the hitherto existing rules, to service as Diplomatic Agent and Consul-General in Egypt. The pension earned in other posts of corresponding importance, such as Embassies, is £1,700 a year.

Egyptian Garrison in the Soudan.

MR. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that the Egyptian Government proposes at an early date to transfer certain native Egyptian troops to the Soudan, and replace them in Egypt by Soudanese troops.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer is in the negative.

The Hague Conference.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the recent vote at the Conference at the Hague in favour of exempting private property from seizure by belligerents at sea, and in view also of the commercial interests in this country which such a decision would protect, His Majesty's Government will instruct their representatives at the Conference, in future, to support and not to oppose that proposal.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Question of the hon. Member, which presumably relates only to the capture of the property of belligerents, raises one part only of a large question, which cannot be considered apart from such questions as blockade. His Majesty's Government cannot send the instruction suggested.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the fact that the entire experience of naval war proves that the destruction of an enemy's transport system and supplies is a most powerful weapon for the purpose of ending a war, whether His Majesty's Government will clearly intimate to the representatives of the Powers at the Hague that this country continues to uphold the policy of the victorious Power at sea being free to blockade its enemy's coasts and to seize all property which is destined for the enemy's territory.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I must refer to the Answer I gave yesterday to the hon. Member for the Knutsford Division of Cheshire.†

Income-Tax Abatements.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether persons whose incomes do not exceed £700 a year, and who have already made a claim for abatement for the year 1907–8 on the forms as originally issued, will be required to make a supplementary claim in respect of earned income if all the material facts have been stated in the claim already made.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Mr. ASQUITH): In the circumstances described the Board of Inland Revenue will be prepared, subject to any inquiries that may appear necessary, to treat claims already entered for the existing statutory abatements as sufficient notice of a claim to relief in respect of any portion of the income included in the claim that may manifestly be earned, and will not insist on the presentation of a supplementary claim.

Farmers' Vehicles—Licences.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a farmer who uses a conveyance solely for the purposes of his business is required by the officers of Excise to take out a licence for such conveyance; and, if so, whether this is in accordance with regulations issued by the Treasury; and whether in this respect there is any difference of treatment by the Excise officers between a farmer and a tradesman.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. ASQUITH): The exemption in favour of trade vehicles is confined by law to those which are "constructed and adapted for use, and are used solely for the conveyance of goods or burden in the course of trade or husbandry." If the construction of the vehicle does not satisfy these conditions a licence must be taken out, whatever the purpose for which it is used.

Telegraph (Money) Bill.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any contracts have been entered into by the Post Office, or any money expended, in respect of works to be executed under the Telegraph (Money) Bill of this year.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The limit of expenditure authorised by the previous Telegraph Acts has just been reached, and the further expenditure required to carry on the works in progress pending the passing of the Bill now before the House will be met out of moneys advanced by the Treasury from the Civil Contingencies Fund.

MR. BOWLES: Have any such advances been made?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Yes, Sir.

Customs Appointments.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many retirements under the age limits have taken place in the Customs outdoor department in each of the grades above that of second-class examining officer during the five years ended 31st March, 1907; and what is the maximum number of officers who will, or have, become eligible for superannuation under the existing retirement condition during the five years ending 31st March, 1912.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The information which the hon. Member asks for in the first part of the Question will be found stated for the several years ended 30th November in the annual Estimates for the Customs. To collect the statistics in one Return and to give the particulars asked for in the last part of the Question would impose upon the Department an expenditure of time and labour which I am unable to authorise. For this reason I must request the hon. Member's indulgence if I am not able to give him full replies to the remaining Questions which he is about to address to me.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1580.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what number of appointments have been made to the position of Surveyor of Customs since the 1st January, 1905; how many of the officers promoted since that date were passed over when their turn first came for promotion; what time, on the average, elapsed between the date when these officers were first considered unfit for the position of surveyor and the date of their subsequent promotion; and what is the average age and the average length of service of the officers affected.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I am informed that for many years it has been the practice to exhibit in a part of the Custom House to which the public have access, for the information of parties concerned, weekly lists of all appointments and promotions of Customs Officers. The Board of Customs have not readily available the full particulars desired, and in the circumstances I am not prepared to request their preparation.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many of the officers promoted by selection to the position of Surveyor of Customs since 1st January, 1905, failed for the junior position of first-class examining officer once; how many twice; how many three or more times; how many officers are there in the Department with more than twenty years' service who are junior to the last officer promoted to surveyorship, and who qualified for the position of first-class examining officer at the first opportunity; and whether there has been any departure from the terms of Treasury Minute, 24th March, 1901, which stated that a system of promotion entirely by seniority would not be for the public advantage.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave on the 6th May last to my hon. friend the Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow†, setting out generally the principles on which appointments in the direct line of promotion in the Customs Service since 1891 have been made. The Answer appeared in the Votes of that date. I do not think it desirable to give the figures asked for by the hon. Member even if they were readily ascertainable.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what increase in the various grades of the landing and warehousing, the clerical, and the water-guard branches of the Customs Department were made consequent upon the imposition of the corn duty, the coal duty, and the sugar duty; and what reductions were made in the various grades when the duties on coal and corn were abolished.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: As was explained by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Answer to a Question by my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil on the 6th March, 1906, the introduction of the three duties referred to involved an increase of 444 persons and an additional annual expense for pay and allowances, travelling, clothing, and law charges of £57,600. It is not possible to state with accuracy what reductions were made on the abolition of the corn and coal duties, as the growth of Customs business in other directions absorbed to some extent the staff which might otherwise have been dispensed with, and any figures I might attempt to give would consequently be largely conjectural.

Mr. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the cost of the Customs Jerquers establishment during each of the last five financial years; how many queries were issued each year, and what was the gross amount brought to the revenue as the result of errors discovered by the Jerquer and his staff; and what are the present number, grades, and salaries of the clerks of the Jerquing staff.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Will the hon. Gentleman inform the House what kind of sprightly official the Jerquer is?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Anyone with experience of Customs' work perfectly well knows. I am informed that there is no separate Jerquer's establishment in the Customs, the work of jerquing forming part of the ordinary duties of the Long Room staff at each Port, and it is not possible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the numbers of the staff employed on, or the cost of, this particular item of work. The Estimates for the current year show the grades and salaries of the clerical staff forming the Port Establishment of the Department by whom the work of jerquing is performed, but no data are readily available for furnishing an answer to the remainder of the Question.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 1318.

*MR. REES: Will the hon. Gentleman for the benefit of those without experience of Customs work say what a Jerquer is?

MR. RUNCIMAN: A man who prepares jerquering notes.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): What is the literal definition of the word?

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what are the salaries of the Collector of London, the Principal of the Statistical Office, the Accountant and Controller-General, and the Office Inspector, London; and what are the number, grades, and salaries of the staffs of which they are the respective heads?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am afraid I cannot add anything to the information furnished by the published Estimates.

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Board of Customs have fixed limits for the position of collectors, inspecting surveyor, and chief officer; and what is the age in each case.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Board of Customs inform me that they have not fixed any definite age limit for admission to the class of collectors, but in the case of junior collectorships, preference—except in very special circumstances—is given to men not over forty-five. No age limit has been fixed for inspecting surveyors. As regards chief officers I must refer the hon. Member to a Question on this subject by the hon. Member for Newton and to my Answer of the 27th February last.†

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the assistant clerks (new class) in the Statistical Office, Customs, have forwarded certain memorials to the Treasury, alleging that the conditions under which they were induced to enter the Civil Service are not being observed; whether they have been threatened with punishment unless they withdraw the charge; whether they have forwarded a further memorial repeating the allegation and attaching copies of official memoranda in substantiation; and, if so, whether he can state how the matter now stands.

MR. RUNCIMAN: This matter was discussed in Committee of Supply on the 16th May last, and I must refer the hon. Member to the debate which then took place.

Irish Jurors List—Revision Fees.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will explain to what Irish account or accounts is the sum of £24,056 raised under the County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act, 1877, credited; and how does the Treasury dispose of the sum of £2,000 received for fees and duties, and £1,632 received on account of the revision of the jurors lists under Section 21.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Of the total sum of £24,056 received under the Act of 1877, £20,424, which was received in stamps, was paid in to the Exchequer and merged in the Revenue of the year. The remaining two items of £2,000 and £1,632 respectively, which were received in cash, were appropriated in aid of the Vote for County Court Officers, etc., Ireland, as shown under Subhead H of the Estimate presented to Parliament.

MR. FLYNN: And is all the money absorbed by the Treasury and paid into no particular Irish fund?

MR. RUNCIMAN: It is merged into the revenue of the year. It is not earmarked to any particular Vote.

Vaccination Exemption at Chester-le-Street.

MR. J. W. TAYLOR (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the action of the magistrates at Chester-le-Street, who, on 3rd July, refused to grant to Mr. Robert Ratcliffe, of Beamish, a vaccination order for his child, although he had stated that he had a conscientious objection to vaccination; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 47.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the action of the magistrates at Chester-le-Street who, on 17th July, refused to grant a vaccination exemption order to Henry Farrer, of Edmondsley, Durham; whether the applicant was questioned at length by the chairman of the bench as to why the exemption was sought for, and, after stating his objections, was informed that he had not complied with the law, and that the bench refused to state in what particulars the applicant had failed to comply with the Act; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I will answer these two Questions together. I have made inquiries into these cases, but I find that both of the applicants mentioned failed to satisfy the justices that they conscientiously believed that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of the children in question. I regret that I have no power to take any action in the matter. The proper remedy for such cases lies, as I have often said before, in the passing of the Vaccination Bill which is now before the House.

Military Drill in Prisons.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state what is the nature and extent of the military drill given to lads under the Borstal system in Borstal, Lincoln, and Dartmoor prisons.

MR. GLADSTONE: No military drill is given to these lads. They are instructed in the physical exercises laid down in the syllabus for elementary schools which was published in 1905.

Prison Treatment of Lads.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what provision is made for the reformatory treatment in prison of lads who, by reason of bad health or poor physique being unfit for drill and hard work, are regarded as unsuitable for admission to Borstal or Lincoln prisons.

MR. GLADSTONE: The lads referred to in the Question are treated as far as possible under what is known as the modified Borstal system now in force at all prisons under the Prison Rule of the 13th July, 1906, which was laid before Parliament in draft on the 9th April, 1906, and published as a Parliamentary Paper. They are employed in association at some useful trade or occupation, they are granted special privileges for marks earned, they are instructed for an hour daily until they have attained the fifth standard, and they attend the lectures and addresses given to all lads treated under this system. Special care is taken to obtain assistance or employment for them on their discharge.

School Hygiene Congress.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware of the fact that several foreign Powers cannot see their way to send delegates to the Second International Congress on School Hygiene to be held in London next month unless they receive invitations from His Majesty's Government; and whether, in the interests of international goodwill and also of education, both in this country and throughout the world, His Majesty's Government will issue official invitations, and so ensure the success of the Congress.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouth, N.): No, Sir; I have received no authenticated official information that any foreign Governments have abstained from sending official representatives to the Congress for the reason alleged in the Question. I have verified from official sources that at least one of the principal European Governments in respect of whom the allegation has been made is in fact sending official representatives to the Congress, having apparently felt no difficulty as to the invitation, so that in their case the allegation must be unfounded. I have heard no suggestion, except as part of the allegation above referred to, that any other Governments have felt differently in this respect. As to the last paragraph of the Question, in view of the facts I have ascertained, as above explained, I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave last week to the hon. Member for Leicester.†

Glamorganshire Education Estimate.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the estimates of the Glamorganshire Education Committee for the year ending 31st March, 1908, in which the estimate for the maintenance of the non-provided schools is limited to the amount of the Government grant, while the provided schools are to receive rate-aid; and what steps he is taking to stop such differentiation.

MR. McKENNA: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answers which I gave to my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil on the 25th April on this subject.‡

Education Department—Medical Bureau.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if any estimate has been prepared as to the cost of salaries and administration of the medical bureau which it is proposed to appoint under the Board; and whether such bureau will supervise medical questions which may arise in Welsh schools.

MR. McKENNA: The matter is now under my consideration in consultation with the Treasury. The Answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative.

Municipal Secondary School Teachers.

MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he intends to take any steps to remove the disability under which certificated teachers engaged in municipal secondary schools suffer by being excluded from the benefits of the Teachers' Superannuation Act, although their contributions to the superannuation fund have been accepted by the Board of Education for the past eight years.

MR. McKENNA: The extension of the Elementary School Teachers (Superannuation) Act to teachers employed in Secondary Schools would require legislation which I am not in a position to undertake, but I may remind my hon. friend that teachers who have contributed to the Deferred Annuity Fund in respect of service in elementary schools will be entitled, on attaining the age of sixty-five, to an annuity based upon such contributions irrespective of whether they remain in recorded service or not.

Monmouthshire Schools Teaching Staffs.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the comparative expenditure on teaching staff and maintenance in provided and non-provided schools in the county of Monmouth; whether he can account for the difference of 14s. 11d. per child by which the expenditure in provided schools exceeds that in non-provided schools otherwise than by unfair differentiation; and what steps he is taking to correct this differentiation.

MR. McKENNA: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave on the 3rd June to my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil on this subject.§

Ranelagh Foundation, Whitefield, Berks.

*MR. E. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the case of the Ranelagh Foundation, Whitefield, Berks, an endowment left for the education of children in the principles of the Church of England and applied under a scheme approved by the Board of Education in December, 1905, to the establishment of a secondary school in which the principles of that Church are to be taught; and whether, if the terms of the scheme are carried out, the grants for secondary schools, either under Articles 36 (a), or 42 to 44 (b) of the recently issued Regulations, will be withheld.

MR. McKENNA: The new Regulations will not prohibit the giving of denominational instruction in this school to scholars whose parents have requested the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 335.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 275.

§ See (4) *Debates*, clxxv., 256.

Governors in writing to supply it, provided it is paid for from funds other than grants or rates. The existing scheme appears to permit of compliance with the Regulations in this respect. Every facility will be given to the Governors to obtain any amendment of their scheme which is necessary in order to enable them to comply with the conditions prescribed for the higher scale of grants. I may perhaps call the hon. Member's attention to Circular 568 which has been recently issued by the Board and deals with these matters.

*MR. E. GARDNER: Arising out of that Answer, may I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that this Foundation has handed over practically the whole of its funds, some £7,000, with the concurrence of the Berkshire County Council and with the approval of the Education Department: whether under the scheme which was granted, certain privileges in connection with giving education in accordance with the principles of the Church of England were conceded; and whether under the new Regulations that teaching will not be permitted?

MR. McKENNA: I am aware of the facts stated by the hon. Gentleman, but the Regulations do not prohibit giving that instruction provided the parents of the children wish it.

*MR. E. GARDNER: Yes, but that is not in accordance with the scheme.

Meals for School Children.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will state in how many areas the provisions of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, 1906, are being applied.

MR. McKENNA: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave to a similar Question on the 24th June last.† In addition to the seven cases there given, the Board have sanctioned the expenditure of rates upon the purchase of food by four other authorities, viz., Bath, Bradford, Norwich, and Cannock.

Building School Grant.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen University): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the special grant of £100,000 for building elementary schools will be subject to the rule imposed by Section 97 of the Education Act of 1870, upon the only Parliamentary grant permissible under that Act, under which rule the conditions for obtaining such grant are to be contained in a Minute of the Board, which is not to be in force until it has lain for not less than one month upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): No, Sir; the conditions referred to apply to the annual Parliamentary grant. The special grant is not such a grant.

Traffic in Titles.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been directed to an article in the current number of the *Saturday Review*, entitled "The Traffic in Titles," in which reference is made to one peerage creation during the Rosebery Administration and to two peerage creations during the late Administration; and whether, having regard to the seriousness of the libel contained therein and the punishment which it deserves, unless it be proved to be true and written in the public interest, he will consider the advisability of moving the Public Prosecutor in this matter?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): My attention has been called to the article mentioned by the Question of the hon. Member. Founded as it is on the merest surmise, it is impossible to treat as serious charges, if they can be so described, made on such flimsy and speculative grounds.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL was about to quote special passages in the article, when

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. Member need carry the matter further by quoting statements from the article.

SIR JOHN WALTON: If I may be allowed to say so, I used advisedly the expression flimsy and speculative, because the inference is drawn from the fact that it is the writer's opinion that certain gentlemen had been ennobled who had no claim to Royal favour resting on public or other services. He draws from that fact the inference that they must have paid cash down. This seems to me, as I said, highly flimsy and speculative.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 902.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But seeing that there is a charge against the Government of the country ought not the writer to be called upon to prove his statement if he can?

SIR JOHN WALTON: The so-called charge is a mere opinion of the writer founded on the grounds he indicates, which do not bear a serious character at all.

Public Meetings on Wimbledon Common.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the prohibition of public meetings upon Wimbledon Common; whether the common conservators have the right so to prohibit meetings or to alter the by-laws without consulting the Board; and what steps will be taken in the matter of preserving the rights hitherto held in respect to public meetings on Wimbledon Common.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (SIR EDWARD STRACHEY, Somerset, S.): The Board of Agriculture have no jurisdiction in connection with Wimbledon Common, which is controlled by conservators elected and appointed under the provisions of a special Act. We have no information as to the by-laws in force, and we should not be consulted with regard to any proposed alteration.

Scottish Agricultural Holdings Act Arbitration.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Law Officers have yet given an opinion with regard to the arbitration under the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906; and, if so, will that opinion be presented to Parliament.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Answer to the first part of my hon. friend's Question is in the negative, and with regard to the second part I understand that it is contrary to the usual practice to publish opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown.

Mahoney Estate, Co. Kerry.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the village of Beaufort was excluded from the sale of the Mahoney estate at Dunloe, county Kerry, whereby James O'Connor and Elizabeth Carson were debarred from purchasing their holdings; and whether, in view of the fact that they have now received notice to quit, although rent has been paid regularly, he will request the Estates Commissioners, through whom the sale of the estate was negotiated, to use their good offices to effect the sale of the remaining portion of this estate.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The village of Beaufort was not included in the estate which was sold by Mr. Mahoney to his tenants. The Estates Commissioners have no knowledge of the service of notices to quit on the occupiers of the village holdings, but they inform me that in any event the matter does not appear to be one in which they could intervene.

Mr. Upton's Moate Estate.

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say why two evicted tenants, on the estate of H. A. S. Upton, Coolatoor, Moate, have been excluded in the sale of that estate, although the landlord is desirous that they should be included as purchasers, at a price to be fixed by the Estates Commissioners.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have made an offer for the purchase of the holdings from which the tenants referred to were evicted, but the owner has declined to accept the price offered. The Commissioners are therefore unable to take any further steps in the matter at present.

Outrages in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of outrages recorded as non-agrarian in which firearms were used during the three months ended 31st March, 30th June, and 30th September, 1906, and the past two quarters of the present year.

MR. BIRRELL: The figures for the quarters ending on the dates named are as follows:—31st March, 1906, thirteen cases; 30th June, 1906, ten cases; 30th September, 1906, nine cases; 31st March, 1907, eleven cases; 30th June, 1907, ten cases.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will give the designations of the outrages recorded as agrarian in which firearms were used during the three months ended 31st March, 30th June, 30th September, and 31st December, 1906, and the past two quarters of the present year, distinguishing the counties and districts in which such outrages were committed.

MR. BIRRELL: I will furnish with to-night's Votes a tabular statement giving the information asked for.[†]

Instruction in Gardening in Irish Schools.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that teachers of primary schools in the rural parts of England are allowed 5s. per pupil for the teaching of gardening, and that such teaching of the future labourers and small farmers in Ireland is of importance to the country; have the Commissioners passed a resolution allowing a similar fee to that paid in England to teachers in Irish primary schools for like teaching; and have the Treasury yet sanctioned the proposed expenditure.

MR. BIRRELL: It is the case that fees for instruction in gardening are given in English primary schools, but not, I think, to the amount mentioned in the Question. I find that last year the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland made a proposal that a special fee of 5s. per pupil should be given for instruction in gardening at rural schools. It was not then considered desirable to entertain the proposal, more especially in view of the inquiry which was being held into the working of the Department of Agriculture. The Report of the Committee shows that numerous witnesses advocated the establishment of school gardens, but the question of the means to be adopted to that end does not appear to have been determined. Personally, I am quite in favour of school gardens, and will see that the matter receives further consideration when opportunity offers.

Abbeylara Evicted Tenant.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the eviction of Miss Alice Connor, of Kilbride, Abbeylara, county Longford, by Mr. John B. O'Reilly, of Carngallen, county Leitrim; whether he is aware that this landlord filed a bill of £8 4s. 6d. on this woman for possession of four acres of bad land; and will he undertake so to amend the Evicted Tenants Bill on Report as to include this poor woman's case.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estate Commissioners have inquired into Miss Alice Connor's application for reinstatement, but have not yet decided what action, if any, can be taken in the case. I have no information as to the second part of the Question. If the Commissioners should decide in favour of Miss Connor's claim, the Bill will of course enable them to deal with the case.

Granard Evicted Tenant.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of James Finnegan, of Ballywillan, Granard, who was evicted twenty-one years ago, and only reinstated because he agreed to purchase his farm at a price, the instalments of which he now finds it impossible to pay; whether any means exist by which this man's annuity could be reduced so as to enable him to pay the instalments as he is willing to do; and will he direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to this case.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace the case referred to in the Question. If the hon. Member will name the estate upon which

---

[†] See page 111–12.

Finnegan is a tenant purchaser the Commissioners will have further inquiries made.

Royal Irish Constabulary—Situation in Belfast.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he had received any information to the effect that 200 men of the Royal Irish Constabulary had held a meeting at Belfast, and threatened to go on strike.

MR. BIRRELL: I have just received from Belfast a telegram relating to one of the matters referred to in the hon. Member's Question, and I have sought for further information on the subject. I desire not to make anything like a full statement of the facts until I have had further information. I may say that the circumstances seem to be greatly exaggerated. Some cases of insubordination occurred amongst a small body of men—not anything like 200—but they yielded at once to the very wise treatment they received, and I am now assured that all danger may be at once dismissed from our minds. There is some dissatisfaction upon the subject of pay, but full consideration will be given to any legitimate complaint.

MR. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one of the district inspectors in Belfast stated that if the police went on strike the Government have 10,000 recruits ready to take their places, and will he, in view of the fact that even according to his own statement information is not of a very clear character, telegraph to Belfast for full information?

MR. BIRRELL: I am expecting to receive full information every minute.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Does the Chief Secretary consider these Questions in the public interest?

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Write him a letter.

Political Pictures—The "Daily Graphic" and Irish Outrages.

MR WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether his attention had been called to an issue of the *Daily Graphic* of 20th July, which gave a picture purporting to represent a very disgraceful outrage, in which the figures were said to be the actual men committing the outrage. Had he any knowledge of any such outrage having been committed in Ireland, and was there any means of identifying the men vouched for by the newspaper; also was there any means of protecting a nation from slanderous and gross libels of such a kind which gave an entirely wrong impression of the state of the country?

MR. BIRRELL: I have seen the picture referred to, and, speaking as Chief Secretary, I must say it was in my judgment a scandalous production. Events take place in Ireland which legitimately give rise to regret, deserve condemnation, and justify anxiety. These events are often exaggerated and misreported, but this is perhaps inevitable. When it comes to publishing broadcast throughout the Empire pictorial illustrations of absolute inventions—and trying to pass them off as historical pictures of actual occurrences, for the purpose of inflaming the public mind, I feel sure all fair-minded men, irrespective of Party, will agree in an unqualified condemnation of such procedure. Unfortunately, to libel a nation is an offence not known to the law, and I know of no protection against such libel but the expression of general disgust.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will do his best, as I believe he is in an influential position in the matter, to see that no libellous pictures on any subject are published?

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Has the right hon. Gentleman's attention been called to the fact that this purports to be not a sketch, but a photograph, and that in the letterpress under the photograph these words occur: "It must not be supposed that our contributor watched the actual proceedings, but the men in this picture are the real moonlighters, who obligingly re-enacted their drama for the benefit to our photographer."

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is the Chief Secretary aware that the *Daily Graphic* advertised these productions in the following terms on placards in very large numbers throughout London: "Outrage and Intimidation in Ireland. Remarkable Photographs."

Mr. BIRRELL: I have already expressed my opinion in the matter.

Granard Letter Deliveries.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any complaints have been received by him as to non-delivery of letters between Granard and Bawn; and, if so, what action he intends taking in the matter.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.; for Mr. Sydney Buxton): No complaints on this subject have reached me.

Land Values (Scotland) Bill.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the declaration that he made on 28th June, in reply to a deputation that waited upon him with regard to the Land Values (Scotland) Bill, to the effect that the Government had no idea of going back upon existing contracts, is to be accepted as applying to existing contracts for the payment of rates in England as well as in Scotland, so that any land values rate that may be proposed by the Government will have to be met by existing ratepayers.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): I think my hon. friend had really better wait a little. I can understand that to an active mind there may be something attractive in the idea of drafting Bills by way of Question and Answer, but the pastime has its inconveniences, and I am afraid I am not prepared at the moment to join him in it.

Appointment of Magistrates.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will state the number of magistrates who have been placed on the commission of the peace in England and Scotland since March, 1906; how many of these were Liberals and how many Conservatives; in how many cases have the objections of Lords-Lieutenant to certain nominees been overruled by the Lord Chancellor; and in how many cases have appointments been made over the heads of the Lords-Lieutenant.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The number, excluding Lancashire, is 3,833. It is impossible to state with any precision how many were Liberals and how many Conservatives, but it is believed that there were about three Liberals in every four appointed. The communications between the Lord Chancellor and the Lords-Lieutenant are confidential.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry. N.): Is it not the practice in England, as in Ireland, to appoint Tories and landlords to be Lords-Lieutenant?

Viscount TURNOUR: What about the Lord-Lieutenant of the County of Cavan? Is the hon. Member for West Islington a landlord and a Tory?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Landlord, certainly; Tory, no.

Saturday Sittings.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the advanced period of the session and the determination of the Government not to hold an Autumn Session, he will arrange, as Leader of the House, for Saturday sittings during the remainder of the present session, in order to facilitate the progress of the Evicted Tenants Bill, the Small Landholders Bills, and other important measures which it is desirable should become law this year.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not at all improbable that some Saturday sittings may be necessary, but I cannot yet say anything on the subject.

Transvaal Loan Bill.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can indicate at what date or period of the session the Transvaal Loan Bill will be introduced.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that the Transvaal Loan Bill has been passed by the Legislative Assembly, and we shall, therefore, be free to proceed with the introduction of the Bill at a very early date, but I cannot fix that date at present.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Will the right hon. Gentleman make the introduction of the Bill dependent on the

Transvaal Government not pressing the Bill for the sale of liquor to natives?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have no knowledge of that matter.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked whether the Government would give additional days for Supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he would be very willing to meet the right hon. Gentleman, but the Session would necessarily be prolonged to an unusual date, and if it was to be concluded as he hoped it would be, about August 24, it was impossible to give more days to Supply. The House did not wish to sit into September for any such purpose.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that the Education Vote was a matter which excited much interest, and that the Local Government Board Vote had not been discussed at all. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take them into account before coming to a final decision. Would he state what was the business for next week?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he thought they had better dispose of this week first. He regretted to say that the Government would be obliged to ask the House to sit on Saturday unless considerable progress were made with the small Bills which were put down for to-morrow. These were the Butter and Margarine Bill, Telegraph Money Bill, Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill, Australia (States Constitution) Bill, Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill, Vaccination Bill, and the Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Bill. They would also wish to take if possible the Vote for the relief of the sufferers in Jamaica. He hoped they might get these to-morrow, and, if so, there would be no sitting on Saturday. On Monday the business would be the report of the Evicted Tenants Bill and the Criminal Appeal Bill. On Tuesday the grant to Lord Cromer and the Third Reading of the Finance Bill. On Wednesday Supply and Vote 8 of the Navy Estimates and the Colonial Services Supplementary Estimate. On Thursday Supply—the Foreign Office Vote.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: When is it proposed to take the Lords' Amendments to the Army Bill?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: On Tuesday.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Will the Third Reading of the Evicted Tenants' Bill (Ireland) be taken next week?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It might possibly be taken on Friday.

MOORE-BAILEY LETTERS.

TEXT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture for Ireland whether he is now prepared to fulfil the pledge he gave to the Leader of the Opposition the other night to produce the entire correspondence which passed between the hon. Member for North Armagh and Mr. Commissioner Bailey.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICUTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): Yes. The House will remember that I gave a pledge that I would communicate with Mr. Bailey, and I gave an assurance that the correspondence should be produced at once. I have communicated with Mr. Bailey, and it appears that four letters have passed between Mr. Moore and himself. He says that he kept no copy of his letters to Mr. Moore, who, so far as Mr. Bailey is concerned, is at full liberty to produce them. I desire to ask the hon. Member if he accepts the copy of the letter published in an evening paper to-night, because if that is so, I shall be able to read the correspondence in a consecutive manner.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): I will read the original myself, which I telegraphed for and have in my hand. It is marked "Private"—and the House will bear that in mind when they consider that the answer to that letter was made use of in this House:—

"University Club, Dublin, March, 1907.

"DEAR MOORE,—I see that as a supplemental question you asked the other day whether the delay in land purchase was due to the 'continual absence of Mr. Commissioner Bailey.'"

That was not the Question I asked. [Loud cries of "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member purports to read the letter. I think he had better read it without comment. If any opportunity arises for comment it should be made later.

MR. MOORE: I shall ask for permission when I have read the letter to make a personal explanation. [The hon. Member then proceeded with the reading of the letter]—

> "I do not know, of course, what was your object, but it may interest you to know that for the last year I attended more days in the office than either of my colleagues, and that as a fact I did not take much more than half the vacation to which I was entitled. You will thus see that you have been strangely misinformed, and I can only surmise that another of my colleagues was intended.
>
> Faithfully yours,
> W. F. BAILEY."

I will read the reply to that.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (interrupting): On a point of order, would it not be better that I should read the correspondence consecutively?

*MR. SPEAKER: I think one Member should read it all. As the matter refers to the hon. Member on my left (Mr. Moore), I think he should read the letters.

MR. MOORE: I have not the original of the letter which the Vice-President read, but he can check my letter as I read. I wrote in reply to Mr. Bailey—I refrain from making any comment—

> "Ulster Club, Belfast,
> 19th March.
>
> DEAR BAILEY—You were appointed by a Unionist Government to see fair play between Wrench and Finucane, and you have sold the pass on every occasion. The first thing my colleagues and I will do when we come back, which will not be far off, is to press for an inquiry into the working of your Department. You can destroy your evidence now, and show this to whom you please.
>
> Yours truly,
> W. MOORE."

The reply which I received from Mr. Bailey was as follows—

> "Mr. Bailey desires to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Moore's letter of the 19th inst. and, inasmuch as it contains grave statements of a threatening and unfounded character, he will take an early opportunity of bringing the matter under notice in the proper quarter."

I wrote in reply to that—

> "Mr. Moore hopes that when Mr. Bailey publishes the correspondence he will make it clear that Mr. Moore's reply was directed to a disloyal attack by Mr. Bailey on one of his colleagues in his letter to Mr. Moore. This is all that was omitted from Mr. Moore's reply."

Having read the correspondence, I now ask leave to make a personal explanation in regard to the charges made against me when one of the letters was selected by the Member for South Tyrone, and used in conjunction—I am not suggesting the the hon. Member was not within his rights —and, after previous arrangement——

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No.

MR. MOORE: I am prepared to accept the statement of the hon. Gentleman, but he stated the contents from his place in the House before the Member for South Tyrone read it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I saw it months ago.

MR. MOORE: If the hon. Gentleman saw it months ago, it points at once to what Mr. Bailey considered the proper quarter. Is a Government official to have his defence made in this House by the hon. Member for Waterford? I asked my Question in the House, when, I think, Mr. Bailey was sitting under the gallery there—I will not pledge myself, but he was there the day before and the day after—because, on no fewer than three occasions coming through the Lobby, I had seen the impartial Estates Commissioner from Ireland in close conference with the Irish Members. I do not say it was not perfectly legitimate—I did not stoop to inquire into their business—but I thought it undesirable in anyone to whom such large administrative powers were confided, and so I asked the Question. I ventured to ask from my own observation what I think was a perfectly legitimate supplementary Question as to whether or not the delay was occasioned by the continued presence away from his office of Mr. Bailey in London. The Question was ruled out of Order, and the next thing I heard was that Mr. Bailey had taken upon himself to challenge my right to ask any Question about his conduct by writing this letter. I should have ignored that—I have no particular pride in these matters——

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: You never had.

MR. MOORE (continuing): But I shall ask any Question which I consider it my duty to ask if it is in order.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Ask for the Wyndham letters.

MR. MOORE: I thought when Mr. Bailey went out of his way to say he was not guilty, but that one of his colleagues was—when he knew that that colleague was a personal friend of my own—the name is, of course, Mr. Wrench—when I found his idea as a Government official of loyalty to his own colleague was to say in his letter that I had been misinformed, and that he surmised—which he did not,—that another of his colleagues was intended, whoever that colleague might be, I thought it was not loyal of Mr. Bailey to make that suggestion. I felt that it was a grossly disloyal act on the part of Mr. Bailey, especially as he had marked his letter "Private," so that I could not send it to the man attacked. I wrote the same evening I got his letter. I may have written with too much heat, but I did it off my own bat and I will take all responsibility and all blame for it. There is nobody else to be blamed, and if there is any punishment to be attached to it I will endure it willingly. All I want to say is that it was my own motion whether it was right or wrong, and it is in no sense a Party matter. Feeling that Mr. Bailey had been guilty of breach of loyalty towards his own colleagues by making this attack, I thought I had a right to say what I did. I may have been imprudent in putting it a bit too strong, but when I am told here what I have been told in this House, that I threatened Mr. Bailey with being deprived of his office, and with penalties in future, I can only say that a reference to the letter will show that I made a statement which any Member is entitled to make from these benches with respect to a Department of which he distrusts the management, and, that is to say, that as soon as he can procure a proper inquiry into the working of that Department he will do so. That is all I said. Anyone who reads the correspondence will see, however much they may differ from its sentiments, possibly from its tone, that at least it is a personal matter between two men; and I do not think it was in keeping with the traditions of this House, or the etiquette of this House, that in order not to benefit Mr. Bailey, but because he thought he could do me an injury, the hon. Member for South Tyrone produced one letter from the correspondence, which was provoked originally by Mr. Bailey himself. As Mr. Bailey had marked his letter "Private," I was anxious he should not say I had prevented him showing my letter, so I said he could show it to whom he pleased. I did not contemplate the House of Commons, but I do not complain. So far as Mr. Bailey is concerned I cannot say I left myself any right to object to the entire correspondence being produced. But I hold that hon. Members should not hold me up, as I have been held up, as a person who has abused his position in Parliament to bring improper pressure to bear upon an Estates Commissioner. I simply wrote and told Mr. Bailey what I thought of the working of his Department, and my hope that at the earliest possible opportunity a satisfactory Court of Inquiry would be appointed to investigate the working of it. That is an object which a great many people in Ireland desire. I hope I have not troubled the House too long.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL rose.

*MR. SPEAKER: No debate is possible. If the hon. Gentleman has any personal statement to make he is of course at liberty to make it.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I wish to make a personal explanation. The hon. Member has implied there was collusion between myself and the hon. Member for Waterford. There is no foundation for that suggestion.

MR. MOORE: On that matter——

*MR. SPEAKER: The House has heard the explanation of the hon. Member.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following

Members from Standing Committee A: Mr. Helme and Mr. Charles Nicholson (added in respect of the Public Health Bill); Mr. Partington, Mr. Nussey, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Sir Frederick Cawley, and Mr. Adkins (in respect of the Public Health Bill); and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Public Health Bill: Mr. Percy Barlow, Mr. Alden, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Marnham, Mr Lief Jones, Mr. Wills, and Mr. Hedges.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C: Colonel Long; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Bowles.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE SERVANTS.

Report from the Select Committee, with Appendix, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 266.]

Minutes of Proceedings and Appendix to be printed. [No. 266.]

NEW BILL.

COUNCIL OF INDIA BILL.

"To amend the Law as to the Council of India," presented by Mr. Secretary Morley; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 292.]

SUPPLY [18TH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS II.

£113,817, to complete the sum for Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, Ireland.

*THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.) said that, owing to circumstances which required very little explanation at his hands, the Vote for this, in some respects, the most important of all Irish State Departments had not been frequently discussed in Parliament. The Minister responsible for the expenditure and for the conduct of the Department was not in the House. The Vote had, therefore, to take its chance with others, and, being of doubtful parentage, was jostled out of the arena. Now, after barely two months experience, during which he had been largely occupied in disposing of arrears of work due partly to the disturbance caused by the labours imposed by the Departmental Committee on the principal officer of the Department, he was called upon not only to defend the Vote—which he was quite ready to do—but to meet suggestions for a new policy which, if advisable, would require legislative sanction, and to apply fresh methods, which he certainly did not shrink from, provided fair time was given for their consideration. The debate would probably be largely occupied with the consideration of the majority and minority Reports of the Departmental Committee of Inquiry. That Committee sat for over a year. It sat at the request of the Government, and discharged its onerous duties with great care, with unsparing labour, and with great ability. It held sittings north, south, east, and west in Ireland, and also in London. A vast amount of evidence was taken from all sorts of people—from county committees, municipal bodies, education authorities, stock-breeders, farmers, and officials. For over a year the Committee turned everything in the country upside down so far as the work of the Department was concerned and examined it most thoroughly. In the result there were two Reports, a majority report and a minority Report. It was not to be greatly wondered at in the nature of things and in the nature of the task imposed upon them that these two Reports, full of interesting and suggestive matter as they were, did not add much light to that already in possession of the Government. In almost every particular save one the Reports differed from each other. The one particular in which they agreed was significant, and he would dwell upon it later on. They both agreed in declaring that the present funds of the Department were inadequate for the work, and they both agreed in recommending that these funds should be immediately increased. He would refer to this point again. The majority Report found that, on the whole, the work of the Department was good; that it was suited to the requirements of the country; and that it ought to be allowed to continue and develop as it had been doing. They recommended, in fact, no change in it. Evidence was received in criticism of the Department's methods, but it was declared that the weight and volume of the evidence was overwhelmingly on the other side. In short, they recommended leaving things pretty much as they were. Against the minority Report, at any rate, nobody could bring the charge of hesitation to recommend change. It was a very interesting document from many points of view, and one in which remarkable industry and ingenuity had been bestowed. A good deal of it was given up to criticism of the Department's methods, and he would deal with that part of the Report in the course of the debate. Its positive recommendations, however, might be summarised thus. It recommended that the Department should be broken up and a great deal of its present functions taken from it; that its Representative Boards, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction, should be abolished; and that three Departments should be established in place of the one which now existed. Those three Departments would be, first the remains of the existing Department reconstructed on lines which Mr. Micks suggested. Secondly, a new Development Department consisting of four Commissioners elected by the Irish Members of Parliament grouped according to provinces, and a fifth Commissioner nominated by the Irish Government. This new Department would have an endowment fund of £1,000,000 a year, and would be "altogether detached and free from the control" either of the Imperial Government or of Parliament. The third of the three Departments suggested was a Forestry Department, which would be also an independent body, separate from the others, and of course possessing an endowment fund of its own, and those three would be in the place of the one that now existed. Whatever view might be taken of these proposals they were, to say the least, not characterised by timidity. In the region both of destructive criticism and of constructive criticism they were certainly comprehensive. But they had that day to view the matter as practical men; and without expressing any opinion as to the merits of these positive recommendations of the minority Report it was enough for him to say on behalf of the Government that any such changes as were suggested would require legislation and an amount of consideration such as it had been impossible for the Government to give to them up to the present. Before coming to the one recommendation on which both the Reports agreed, perhaps it would be well if he took up one or two of the points of criticism in the minority Report which had come under his own ken since he had been in the Department. On this matter he wished to say just two things. The first was this. A great machine of administration like the Department in its motion through seven years must necessarily have generated friction at certain points. Moreover, as it was intended, in the words of the Recess Committee, "to make experiments and see some fail," it had made various experiments and had seen some of them fail. Hon. Members would find that in the minority Report every one of those cases of friction and all those instances of failure, whether of remote or recent date, was taken up, and examined with the greatest minuteness and detail. He did not know whether hon. Members would care to go into these cases. If they did he would try to answer them to the best of his ability. But he would point out that his ability was limited in the matter, and that for what belonged to the past he could not accept any responsibility. A second thing he wanted to say was this. The Report of the majority of the Committee in more than one place, and especially in its concluding paragraph, paid a tribute to the devotion to duty and the ability of the officers and staff. He had not been long enough in office to speak with full authority on this point, but he could speak of the readiness to help and the ability of which he had been witness, and he felt pleasure in paying this tribute to a body of hard-working officials who thoroughly deserved it. He would now like to call attention to some points in the minority Report which asserted that the public interest had suffered by a lack of business-like methods.

In regard to this three serious cases were set out by Mr. Micks. The first related to the headmastership of the School of Art in Dublin. By the death of the headmaster a vacancy occurred some two years ago or more. For some reason or other that vacancy was allowed to extend over a period of two years. It was quite impossible that the school should not have suffered by the long vacancy. The vacancy was caused by the death of Mr. Willis—an extremely competent man. The defence of the Department for the delay was this. A Commission was appointed to consider the position of the Hibernian Academy and the Metropolitan School of Art. It sat for a considerable time, and like a good many Commissions planted on Irish soil within the last few years, it had produced two Reports, but it was not considered possible while it was sitting to appoint a headmaster. The view he took on coming into office was this. The Commission disagreed. Their Report had been printed, but no one had paid the slightest attention to it, and he did not see why he should maintain the vacancy an hour longer. He was extremely fortunate in getting an Irishman by birth to fill it. This gentleman had served his apprenticeship at this work in Belfast, and was well able to discharge the duties. He had accepted the position and would enter upon his duties very shortly. This disposed of the School of Art. The second question to which Mr. Micks devoted his attention was the new Veterinary College. Under the Act of 1899 £15,000 were allocated for the erection of a Veterinary College in Dublin and the Department was given discretion to add to that statutory grant. When he reached the Department the £15,000 had been paid with an addition of £5,000. The college had asked for £10,000 more, had asked for a considerable time, and there was a complaint of the delay caused by the Department. He was not going to enter into the question of the delay for which he was in no way responsible, but the fact was that he settled the matter by giving, not £10,000 but £5,000 and a balance of £1,640. That matter was now definitely closed. Thus the second case was settled. There was another matter about which there had been serious friction between the Department and the City Corporation —he referred to the grant under the Act of some £50,000 to the city of Dublin for a technical school on the north side of the city. Long before he became Vice-President of the Department he took part in that controversy, and, whoever was to blame, the city had undoubtedly suffered for five or six years by being deprived of this school, and so far as he was concerned he was determined the city should not suffer a day longer than he could help. He knew that the Technical Education Committee of the Corporation had had quarrels about a site, but they now agreed, and, as representing the Department, he now said that that £50,000 was at the disposal of the corporation when it decided to proceed. The Department would take no further responsibity for delay. Another and still more serious matter was the relations of the Department to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society. That was a burning question, and it had given rise to great trouble in this House, in Ireland, and in the Department itself. He wanted to make a plain statement on that matter, and he wanted the attention of hon. Members below the gangway especially in regard to his personal attitude on the question. The Department —that was to say the late Vice-President, the Board of Agriculture, and the Council—had alike been parties to a subsidy—for the present year it amounted to £3,700 — to an outside body called the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society. That society was founded before the Department came into being by Sir Horace Plunkett, whose work in this connection deserved grateful recognition, and claimed, indeed, to have been the pioneer and forerunner of the Department. The society existed mainly for the purpose of organising and developing agricultural co-operation, than which nothing could be more necessary not only in Ireland but elsewhere. He observed from the Bill now before one of the Standing Committees relating to small holdings in England that there was a great deal about co-operation. For some time, however, the grant to this society had been the cause of great division and friction in this House and in Ireland. Anyone who desired to know the history of this feud would find it admirably summarised in the minority Report, pages 54 to 66. [A laugh.] The hon. Member for

North Londonderry smiled, but he said it was an admirable summary of the controversy. The grant to this society was given after a full debate and a division in November, and it was made for one year. The Council would meet again in November next, and he presumed that the matter would then come up for consideration. Indeed it must do so, the grant being for one year only. Personally he held the same view as his predecessor in regard to the value of, and the necessity for, agricultural co-operation. He understood and fully appreciated the necessity in a country like Ireland, where they were literally engaged in the remaking of many things, of an active organising propaganda, and he was prepared to encourage such a policy; but when the real issue came to be covered, as in this case, by the proposition that the State should subsidise an outside organisation whose income had naturally shown a strong tendency to diminish just as the State subsidy increased, and which more or less came to rely on the State crutch as the principal source of its income—when a condition of affairs like that arose, there was certainly something to be said. To meet that very point the arrangement made last year in acccordance with the resolution passed by the Council of Agriculture fixed the Department's subsidy on a *pro rata* basis, the Department's grant being given in a fixed proportion to the income obtained by the society from other sources. But, of course, if these co-operative societies were to become general trading bodies, as distinguished from purely agricultural societies, competing with ordinary traders in the country, and not only competing in agricultural implements, seeds, and things of that kind, but competing in general merchandise, then still further reasons might legitimately be required why public money should be voted to prosecute operations of that kind. He understood and approved of co-operation, or even the organisation of co-operation, but co-operation by means of a State subsidy was a wholly different thing, and must be considered on its own merits. He should make it his business to hear fully the arguments of the representatives of the Agricultural Organisation Society and others. He had received a deputation from the manufacturers and traders, and as this important question must be considered at the next meeting of the Council of Agriculture, he would be prepared to state then the views he held and the policy that should in his judgment govern the Department in the matter. Now he came to the actual work of the Department in the West of Ireland. There was some difficulty about this matter. Some hon. Members had the idea that the Department was responsible for the distress that might arise in that part of the country, but he would point out to those who held that opinion that the Department was not responsible for the relief of any distress that might arise in the West. When the Act of 1899 was passed the Department was expressly precluded from spending its money in relief of distress in the congested districts or to do any work in those districts. A change in the law occurred in 1903 under the great Act passed by the right hon. Member for Dover in that year. That restriction was removed, and by arrangement the Department took over from the Congested Districts Board those duties in those districts so far as they related to agricultural education. But, unfortunately, when the right hon. Gentleman transferred these duties he transferred very little money with them. All the Department received from the Congested Districts Board for undertaking these duties was £2,000. They had spent, or proposed to spend, that year some £9,700, and instead of that sum they really wanted £30,000 for the work. At present they were obliged to take the £9,700 out of the reserve fund. But instead of £9,700, they urgently required £30,000; and both the Reports said that there was an urgent demand for a grant of something like that sum. It might be asked what they were doing inland.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) asked if the Minority Report did not ask for £8,000 for the Congested Districts Board and £30,000 in addition.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said he would come to that later on. It might be asked what work they were doing in the congested districts of the West of Ireland. Well, here was the Agenda Paper before the Agricultural Board in Dublin last week. They required for the agricultural overseers' salaries and expenses, £2,500; administrative expenses, £1,500; premiums on bulls, £1,830; cost of allocating land, £600; maintenance, salaries, depreciation, and cost of improvements, £1,150; expenses of purchase, railway charges, etc., £250; contingencies, spraying potatoes, etc., £850. Take the question of the potato crop. A fortnight ago they were in despair. The season was the worst and most inclement since 1879, and so far as the prospects of the potato crop were concerned, the people in the West of Ireland were in despair. The rain came down day by day and the turf was floating about. Indeed, the state of affairs was very bad. But now the weather had changed; they had had something like a fortnight of exceedingly fine weather, and the effect of that was a change from possible disaster to something like comparative safety. He must confess that had the bad weather continued and distress ensued he would have rather dealt with anything than with such a calamity as that, and it was an absolute relief to him personally that at the present time there was a brighter outlook. They had done all that they possibly could in the way of inducing the people to spray the potatoes. Of course they could not send instructors to every field to do the work; but short of that they had provided every facility for spraying the potatoes, and brought the facilities to the doors of the people. They had authorised the County Committees to purchase sprayers and hire them out at 6d. a day. They had supplied them with the materials — sulphate of copper and washing soda—at cost price; they had published placards and leaflets; and had interested every man in a public position to bring his influence to bear on the people to spray their potato crop. There were a large number of people who would not spray at all even when the benefit of it was thrust upon them, and there were some who could not afford to purchase machines but who were doing the work by primitive means. They had done their best. They had drawn from the agricultural colleges and agricultural schools every available man who had the necessary training and sent them to the West of Ireland; and he was happy to say that more spraying was done this year than ever had been before, and that there was every prospect of a great disaster being averted. There was one point which he would like to mention to the Committee. A great deal of money was wasted in administration. He happened to be an *ex-officio* member of the Congested Districts Board, and had done his best to attend its meetings, with the result that he should like to see something like co-ordination in this work and that of the other Departments. There was a great deal of overlapping. Let him give a sketch of what he would like to do. During his journey to the West the other day he visited eleven holdings which had been purchased and resold by the Estates Commissioners. They were sold to eleven sons of neighbouring tenant farmers. Personally he called that an excellent thing, although it did not relieve congestion in the ordinary way. If, however, those eleven stalwart men had been left on their fathers' farms they would all have been in America in a couple of years. They were now each on a thirty-acre farm; they would be married in a year or two, and, as one of them told him, they would get a bit with their wives, so that they would be able to stock their farms, and in a few years rising and prosperous families would be the result. That seemed to him a very excellent way to stop emigration. But let him point out that the Estates Commissioners planted these men down on their thirty acres of land, but there was no provision for a house or for stock. Here the Department came in and opened an Agricultural Bank which would lend money to put stock on the land; but still when this was done houses and out-offices had to be built and provided. How was this to be done? He thought there was a great deal of overlapping which might be avoided, and if the work could be done scientifically, money would be saved. He did not know whether the Members below the gangway realised it quite, though right hon. Members on the Front Opposition Bench did, that every Department in Ireland was willing to take over all the work they could get hold of. He had had some experience of these matters at the Local Government Board, and what he wanted to secure was a scientific co-ordination of this work. He wanted to make an appeal to the Committee—not only to Irish Members—on this subject. This was a work which ought to be done. He was speaking, fortunately, that night in the presence of three right hon. Gentlemen who had held the office of Chief Secretary, and he was sure that they would admit that it was work which ought to be done. He knew that he would have their sympathy when he said they ought not to be "cribbed, cabined and confined" to the use of a few thousands from an Irish fund which they had no technical right to spend. He said that they ought to have a fund at their disposal which would enable them to set about the work in earnest and put the people on their feet by starting them in their holdings, which at present they could not stock and could not work. He thought that for this work they would require at least £30,000 per annum. He would not go fully into the question of income and expenditure now, but he might say that there was a general idea that with their income the Department had a gold mine in Merrion Street, and that they had money for anything and everything and were hoarding it up. When the Department was formed it was quite true that for the first two or three years they were not able to spend all their income; they required experience, and for a few years the fund accumulated to a large amount. To-day the endowment fund gave an income of £180,000 and Parliament voted £191,000. He had heard it said that this was an extraordinary amount of money for the Department to get, and he hoped the House would allow him to give some details of this £191,000 and how it was spent. The sum voted was spread over various science, art, and other institutions not strictly connected with but which were transferred to the Department. The Accumulated Fund in July, 1906, was £395,230; on 31st March, 1907, it amounted to £353,296, and of this £53,318 belonged to technical schools, and £42,040 was taken up by fixed charges. On 31st March, 1907, there was a clear Reserve Fund of £134,335, upon which all kinds of raids were attempted. It could easily be disposed of if the Department listened to all the applications made. There were people in Ireland insane on the subject of peat, and who had an idea that, with the expenditure of a little money and the use of their services, Ireland might be turned upside down and made a happy country for all time. A good deal of money had been sunk in the bogs of Ireland, and the Department had sunk some, but he would sink no money in an Irish bog until he could see further. All sorts of other proposals there had been—the drainage of the Bann and Barrow districts, for instance — work that undoubtedly should be done, but he refused to give a penny from the Reserve Fund for such a purpose. These, like the distress in the West, were matters that should be dealt with by the State Treasury, and he claimed to keep a tight hold of the Reserve Fund for departmental purposes. If hon. Members would make suggestions as to how the £134,000 should be spent, he would be glad to hear them. There was an idea abroad that the Department ought to promote, subsidise, and even start new industries, but that the Department was forbidden to do by the Act of 1899.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): Not as regards rural industries.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL agreed that as regarded rural industries they might, but as regarded other industries they might not. The policy might be right or wrong, and he expressed no opinion upon it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) inquired whether the hon. Gentleman could not follow the precedent set by the President of the Board of Education.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said he was not going to take any responsibility for things for which he was not responsible, and which could only be dealt with by way of legislation. He was not there to administer the Report of the Recess Committee, but to administer the Act of Parliament. He was there, not to administer the speeches of Members, but the Act of 1899, and under the Act the subsidising of all industries other than rural industries was forbidden. As the debate went on, the Committee would, no doubt, have a great deal of information from hon. Members representing Ireland, who knew what had been done, and who would suggest what should be done. He could only say he would listen attentively to the debate, and attempt to do what was right. He would say in conclusion that, quite apart from its being the work in which he was most interested, money spent in the West was well spent. He remembered when the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition went there twenty years ago. He and the right hon. Gentleman were political opponents now, but were not then, and he sympathised with what the right hon. Gentleman did then. They could not expect machinery like this to act all at once, but anybody who went to the West of Ireland twenty years ago and knew what it was like then, and saw it now could not fail to see the enormous change that had taken place, and was still going on. He wished to impress on the Committeee the necessity for spending money in the West of Ireland, and, of course, other parts as well, but principally in the West. The profit that England would gain by doing its duty there would be enormous. Money spent there was well spent, and he hoped the Committee would not allow machinery like this to stand idle for the sake of a few thousands of pounds.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.) congratulated the hon. Gentleman on the statement he had made, and the Committee upon having the chief officer of this administrative Department in the House to speak for it. The Department had been in existence for seven years, and the present was the first time they had been able to have a debate of this character. When the Department was created one point insisted upon was that the chief of the office should have a seat in the House of Commons. Circumstances arose which prevented that, and for seven years the Irish Party had been pressing the Government which brought the Department into existence to make some arrangement to enable the head of the Department to be in the House. The hon. Gentleman was there at last, and the Committee had had the advantage of hearing from him a most interesting speech. This subject had been selected by the Irish Members for discussion, because of the disastrous effects of the weather this year, and the possible effect of it on the harvest. They looked forward with the greatest anxiety to a possible failure of the harvest, and desired to press on the Government the necessity of taking steps as early as possible, to prevent a calamity. The hon. Gentleman in charge of this Department recognised the necessity of doing something, and had taken such steps as were thought within the power of the Department of a preventive character. The hon. Gentleman had spoken of the Western problem. There was not a Member of the Nationalist Party who was not more or less interested in the problem, because while it was true it related particularly to Connaught and the Western counties, what was called the Connaught problem was applicable to the whole of Ireland. The hon. Gentleman as an illustration of the urgency of this question had referred to a district in which a number of young men had been planted on a large holding, which had been divided among them, but which previously had provided support for no human being. One of these young men he knew personally, and some of them were making arrangements before this holding was divided to cross the Atlantic and join the millions in America. These men were now settled on the land, and the hon. Gentleman had said the work of the Commissioners was finished when they planted them there. He found now that the work of the Department commenced in assisting them. So far as assisting agriculturists planted on economic holdings was concerned, the Department should devote itself in a special manner to those portions of the country where the occupiers were the owners of their land. One of the reasons for the suspicion which existed with regard to this Department was that men who had long experience of agriculture in Ireland believed that its work would lead to the increase of the rent which landlords wrested from the tenants. But no such feeling of distrust and suspicion could arise in the case of occupiers who were the owners of their holdings. Such men had every incentive to industry, to develop the land, and in those cases there was a full, fair, and free field for the work of the Department. He, therefore, as a matter of policy, suggested that the Department should devote itself in a particular manner to every portion of the country where the occupiers had become the owners of the land, but more particularly to the cases of those persons who had got new holdings, where the untenanted land had been purchased and divided and new holdings created. It was felt in a most particular manner that it was obligatory on a Department such as this to follow up the work of planting the people on the land by using every possible means of education and assistance for cultivating the land in a manner profitable to themselves and the community. Apart from the peculiar circumstances created by the condition of the crops during the present year as a reason for having this matter discussed, there was also the reason that the Report of the Committee of Inquiry had recently been issued. The Department had been in existence seven years, and when this Government came into office about a year and a half ago one of the first things they did was to appoint a Committee to inquire into the working of the Department. That Committee had investigated the subject fully—many thought too fully. There again the suspicions of Irishmen and their representatives were justified, because the inquiry was not called for by public opinion, and it was rushed to such an extent at the start that, before the assembling of Parliament, or before the matter could be ventilated in the House, it was believed that there was an ulterior object in instituting the investigations. One effect it had was to leave the Department without a representative in that House for a year and a half, and some people thought that that had something to do with the appointment of the Committee of Inquiry and also with its prolongation. At the time the inquiry began the Department had been scarcely six years in existence. Two Reports had resulted—the Majority and Minority Reports. The Minority Report also justified the feeling which existed, that the Committee was intended to be one of a whitewashing character. As the hon. Gentleman had remarked it was one which showed that very considerable industry and ingenuity had been used in its production. It was the one Report which was of real interest in connection with a debate of this kind, and for all practical purposes, except as a matter of duty, it would scarcely be necessary to refer at all to the Majority Report. Indeed, it was noteworthy that the hon. Gentleman himself had referred solely to the Minority Report, which contained a very interesting summary of Irish history so far as related to the economic condition of the country. The late Vice-President of the Department issued a work on the same subject, not in the form of a Blue-book, as this was, and both he and Mr. Micks traced the reasons for the uneconomic condition of Ireland. The late Vice-President attributed many of the evils in Ireland to causes inherent in the Irish people which could not be dealt with or cured. He attributed it to the religion of the majority of the Irish people, to the existence of priests in the country, and to the fact that they spent too much money in building churches. The form of thought in Ireland, according to this philosopher and economist, might have been suitable for Eastern countries a couple of thousand years ago, but was not suitable for Western lands in the twentieth century. The late Vice President also thought the evil of Ireland arose from the fact that the Irish people rather looked to the hereafter to than the present. Mr. Micks, on the other hand, in the minority Report, also proceeded to trace the reason for the present state of Ireland, and he had found the real reason. It was not the particular form of religion or religious thought which accounted for the condition of that country, but, in the opinion of Mr. Micks, the true reason was to be found in the Statute-book of this country. Mr. Micks showed that hundreds of years ago, and down to very modern days, there were industries upon an extensive scale in Ireland, and the people of the country were prosperous. But the people of this country, wishing to raise themselves into a position of prosperity and preponderance in the industrial world, by Act of Parliament passed at the instance of manufacturers of this country suppressed the industries of Ireland, and suppressed them with as little compunction as in these days they suppressed the right of public duty and free speech. Sometimes, when they said that Irish industries had been suppressed by Act of Parliament, Englishmen replied that it could not be the fact. He would recommend Members carefully to read the Report, as was their duty, since they undertook the responsibility of governing Ireland, and they would then find the causes of the uneconomic state of things which existed in Ireland. Many Members perhaps regarded the Report merely as a Blue-book, but sometimes there were to be found within the pages of a Blue-book matters of very great interest, and no more tragic story could be found in the books of the libraries of this great city than was contained in the pages of the Blue-book signed by Mr. Micks. Who was Mr. Micks? He had asked several of his colleagues whether he was an Irishman, and for his own part he did not know whether he was or not, and he had not come across anyone who could tell him whether he was an Irishman or an Englishman. This much they did know, that all the years of his manhood he had been an official of the English Government in Ireland. His politics were unknown to any of the Irish Members, and they took his work absolutely for what it was and upon its merits. Mr. Micks spoke with regard to Ireland not as a strong and extreme Irish Nationalist politician but as a Government official of long experience of various portions of Irish administration. He had been an inspector of the Local Government Board, in which capacity he travelled a good deal over Ireland. He had been secretary to the Congested Districts Board, in which capacity he was brought into contact with what the hon. Gentleman had truly described as one of the most interesting and important problems connected with the life of Ireland or of any other country. For some years he had been a member of the Local Government Board, which, as most hon. Members knew, was a completely unrepresentative, irresponsible, and autocratic body who largely ruled the country. It was this man, not a demagogue, not an agitator, who had traced back the uneconomic condition of Ireland to its real cause, and that was the hostile legislation of England in, not discouraging, but suppressing by law and making illegal the woollen industry and industries of that character which existed in Ireland. They were sometimes asked why was a portion of the North of Ireland more prosperous than the rest of Ireland. The one industry which existed in the North of Ireland in those days when Acts of Parliament were passed to suppress industry was the linen industry. There was no rival to the linen industry in England, and therefore the linen industry in the North of Ireland was not suppressed, but was encouraged and subsidised. Of the industries of the other portions of Ireland, the principal was the woollen industry. In the Blue-book they found that the manufacturers of Bradford and elsewhere, jealous of the growth of those industries, petitioned the Sovereign to get his Parliament to enact laws to suppress those industries in Ireland which came into competition with the industries of this country. It was remarkable that these Acts of Parliament which dealt with the industries of foreign countries enacted that for the purposes of those laws Ireland was to be regarded as a foreign country. It was the duty of every British Member who had assumed, and continued to assume, the responsibility for the government of Ireland to study documents of this character and take action upon them. There were many matters connected with the Department dealt with in that Report, but there was one remarkable fact or idea running largely through it which for years had been in the minds of hon. Members in that part of the House, and it was that the Department dealt largely in theory and very little in practice. It was true that by law it was prohibited from entering into the industrial domain in towns. His opinion was that it could do a great deal in practice as well as in theory under the present state of the law. The hon. Member for North Dublin had said it was not forbidden in connection with rural industries, but there was in the evidence of Sir Horace Plunkett a statement that the conception of duty which existed in the minds of the Department and its officials was that it was entirely advisory and educational, and could assist so far as advice was concerned but not otherwise. This Department had been the means of spending something approaching £450,000 a year. That was a large sum, and naturally they had been looking for some results. They had allowed this Department considerable time to show some results, and even in seven years of educational work some results ought to be apparent. In his opinion no results were apparent, and the country certainly had not got value for the money spent. The Irish people were sometimes charged by Englishmen with being a sentimental race, and sometimes with being of a rather material character. An instance of that might be found in the Irish Council Bill, when the general opinion was that the Irish people would be willing to swallow that measure on account of the money attached to it. The rejection of that measure showed that when dealing with hard facts they were as ready to face them as hard-headed Englishmen or Scotsmen. Here was nearly £500,000 of their own money being spent every year, and he wished to know if the hon. Member or his officials could show any real value for it. The answer would probably be that there had been an improvement in the breed of cattle, horses and poultry, but he would like to have some facts and figures as to that improvement. A great deal of money had been spent upon officials, of which there was a huge army connected with the Department. Some years ago a Return of those officials was published, and he would like to ask that that Return might be brought up to date. When that Return was issued on the last occasion it was quite a revelation to many of them to find what a vast army of officials existed, and he understood that the number had been largely increased since. He urged the Chief Secretary to give an order for the issue of that return up to date as a Parliamentary Paper. Mr. Micks, in his Report, referred to some questions of great importance, and one of them was winter dairying. With that there was connected another question of great importance to every part of Ireland, which bore upon the subject of emigration. Tillage on a much larger scale must take place, and that would involve a great deal of employment. One of the most important agricultural industries undoubtedly was the butter industry. In past years Ireland held a high place in the butter markets of this and other countries, and it was recognised that in order to hold the market they must be able to supply butter all the year round. Their supply in Ireland was very largely a summer supply. They had now been brought into competition with Denmark, where they were able to hold the market because they gave an all the year round supply. This question had engaged the attention of the Department, which had consulted, debated, advised, and resolved, but had not acted. Everybody connected with the Department recognised the advantage, if not the necessity, of winter dairying. The matter was brought before the Agricultural Council in April, 1904, and a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of winter dairying, and urging the Department to take immediate action. For over two years there was nothing to show that this matter had been discussed by the Department or by the Board of Agriculture. This Committee of Inquiry came into existence, and evidence relating to the necessity of winter dairying was given by a Limerick merchant. Then for the first time the matter was brought by the Department before the Agricultural Board. Since then nothing had been done, although they had had pious expressions of opinion in favour of winter dairying. He thought £450,000 a year was a little expensive for the expression of pious opinions. The Agricultural Council was simply a debating society, and had no power to act. He thought this was a matter which ought to be taken into serious consideration by the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL was understood to say that he had brought this question before a meeting of the Agricultural Board, and that the question was not being lost sight of.

MR. HAYDEN said that was a most satisfactory statement. That in itself was a proof of the necessity of having the Department represented in the House. Under the circumstances he thought he need not further urge the subject. As to the question of transit, he thought it would be hard to find a matter of greater national importance to all parts of Ireland. What was the Department doing in connection with that subject? The Act of 1899 conferred upon the Department certain powers of a limited character, but such as they were they had never been used. The Department had failed up to the present to realise the vast importance of the subject. The railway charges in Ireland had hindered the development of industries, and certainly they had prevented the creation of many. The Department was divided into several sections, but there was no section specially charged with the supervision of matters relating to transit. The transit question was treated in a sub-department of the veterinary Department. Men who were called veterinary inspectors were sent out to fairs in the country, but in most cases they knew absolutely nothing of veterinary science; while cattle were being loaded they stood on the railway banks to see that the boxes were clean. That was very important work, but it was not work for which a veterinary inspector should get £350 or £400 a year. In his opinion it was work which could be done by a good class of labouring men at £1 a week. He admitted that, though the veterinary inspectors knew little about veterinary work, they knew something about railway work. As showing the red tape character of the Department he said that the inspectors' reports had to go through several channels before they reached the Vice-President. He suggested that the Vice-President should consider whether or not all officials, even those holding minor posts, should be brought into immediate contact with himself. It was a matter of satisfaction that a representative of the Agricultural Department in this House could now be asked for information at first hand by the representatives of the country on such a question as the subsidy to the Agricultural Organisation Society. He had no doubt that this debate would have a beneficial effect on all concerned in the agricultural development of Ireland.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said the Report of the Departmental Committee had been looked forward to with exceptional interest. It had now appeared, and included a Majority Report signed by four members of that Committee, and a Minority Report signed by Mr. Micks alone. The evidence, indeed, had not yet been issued; that they must regard as the habitual method of the Government in such inquiries. But the Report as it stood shed great light on subjects on which light was most needed. The hon. Gentleman the Member for South Roscommon declared that the Committee was appointed merely in order to bring out a "whitewashing" Report, and that the majority had now discharged this duty. The names of the gentlemen who formed the Committee were a sufficient answer to the suggestion that they could lend themselves to such a service. The Department of Agriculture in Ireland had been vehemently attacked in certain quarters. It came into collision with two sets of persons—on the one hand with representatives of trade interests, who were hostile to the co-operative movement; on the other hand with Nationalist politicians. In the course of the inquiry, which was publicly held, one of the interesting facts which had come out was that in all parts of Ireland the weight of public opinion had been cast in favour of the Department. The Report of the Committee endorsed and fortified that favourable opinion. He would rapidly run over some of the points in the Report. First, the conclusions reached as to the constitution of the Department and scope of its powers testified to the sound and far-sighted judgment of Mr. Gerald Balfour, who set it up. Only slight modifications were here recommended. Next, a remarkable tribute was paid to the work done by the Department in the last seven years. The magnitude of the task was sometimes forgotten; it was nothing less than to build up from the foundations the whole system of agricultural and technical instruction. The results achieved were striking; but, still more important, the methods pursued were pronounced to be the right methods, and special praise was given to the elasticity and variety of method which had marked the Department's policy. Some mistakes had admittedly been made, but these did not detract from the main conclusion, that the Department was working on true lines of development and progress. Moreover, not only was the central work of the Department approved, but the Report bore witness to the harmonious relations between the offices in Dublin and the local Committees of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. This deserved to be emphasised, because the hope of the future lay largely in enlisting local interest and effort. One word, too, as regards the staff. Sir Horace Plunkett had been sharply criticised for importing aliens from England or Scotland in order to act as expert advisers of the Board. But most Irishmen were now agreed that he had done rightly in bringing in the best men, wherever they were to be found. These experts from outside were each year turning out a large and well-trained body of Irish men and Irish women to carry on the work of education. The whole staff of the Department were spoken of by the Committee in these terms of striking recognition—

> "In point of zeal, devotion to duty, and practical good sense and ability, the staff of the Department, so far as we have had an opportunity of forming a judgment, is entitled to a high place in the records of the Civil Service."

The Majority Report of the Committee was surely a final and authoritative answer to the carping criticism levelled against the Department for several years past. The hon. Member for East Mayo had spoken in the House not long ago of—

> "the comparative failure of the work of the Department, which had been in a large

> measure due to the personality of Sir Horace Plunkett;"

and he added—

> "that the amount of practical work which the Department had to show for this vast expenditure was positively ludicrous."

Similarly the hon. Member for North Camberwell had declared that—

> "the Department had spent nearly £200,000 a year and its whole function had been to teach hens how they ought to lay eggs!"

They could have no better illustration of the unfair manner and mind with which some hon. Members approached this question; but such irresponsible talk was no longer possible.

There was one point of special interest on which the two Reports were in agreement; it related to the position of the Vice-President of the Department. The Majority Report recommended that the Vice-President of the Department should henceforth hold a non-Parliamentary office; experience had shown that his proper place was in Ireland rather than at Westminster. In the Minority Report there appeared to be no dissent from that view. Here he could not help reminding the Committee of a statement made by the Chief Secretary for Ireland in April last. The right hon. Gentleman then said that—

> "the position was intended by Parliament to be, and in fact is, a Ministerial and Parliamentary Office. . . . It is the fixed intention of the Prime Minister that the office should be a Ministerial Office. . . . From that view and that intention we do not intend in any way to depart."

But not many weeks afterwards the Irish Council Bill was introduced and it was there provided that the post should no longer be a Parliamentary one. So rapid was his conversion when once Sir Horace Plunkett had been got rid of! What was the upshot of it all? The late Vice-President had been dismissed from office for having committed the sin—the unforgiveable sin in the eyes of some Nationalist politicians—of having diverted the minds of the people from politics to industry. He had been replaced by an hon. Gentleman who had played many political *roles*, but had never deviated from party politics on the one side or the other. This was all that had been gained by yielding to the envenomed attacks made on Sir Horace Plunkett.

But to pass to the two alternative policies which the two Reports represented. The policy supported by the majority of the Committee was the policy of the Department, namely, that technical and agricultural education in its largest sense was the main agency on which they must rely for calling forth self-reliance and personal initiative, and so leading to the promotion of industries. The other alternative, represented by the Report of Mr. Micks, was to take certain short cuts to prosperity by the direct subsidy of industries. The policy of the Department had been to train skilled workers in schools and in workshops and also to provide expert advisers in the preliminary stages of industrial development. They believed that given well-trained workers with industrial aptitudes, capital would be attracted into various localities. It was true there were certain marginal cases in which it was not easy to say whether State aid for technical instruction did not pass into State aid for a given industry. Educational work on its practical side might sometimes be of a definitely trade character. No unvarying rule could be laid down. The Department had sought to judge the cases each on its own merits. Now and then they had in the opinion of the Committee exceeded their powers by financing such an industry as the Kilkenny Woollen Mills; but this was contrary to their usual practice, which was not even indirectly to aid any enterprise so as to bring it into rivalry with existing trades. The Vice-President referred to that part of Mr. Micks' Report in which he condemned the Department for granting a subsidy to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society. But in so doing the Department had not subsidised a trade concern, but had merely given money for the teaching of the principles of agricultural co-operation.

Yet Mr. Micks, who held this strict view about the use of public funds in a particular instance, propounded a vast scheme for creating and fostering State-aided industries. A million of money a year for twenty years from the Imperial Exchequer should go to Ireland for this purpose. The State was to start industries and build factories. No more unwise or dangerous policy could be proposed. If the subsidised industry failed, the public money spent on it would be wasted, and if it succeeded, there would be an outcry from all the unaided industries, and trade jealousies in England and Ireland would be aroused. England did indeed owe reparation to Ireland. She owed her large amends for the past. How could she repay the debt? Englishmen had shown that they desired to make all reasonable amends. The simplest way, no doubt, was for them to put their hands in their pockets and ladle out money—the simplest way, but also the worst. It was not unnatural for people in Ireland to say, "England has ruined our industries; let her repair the injury; let English gold flow in and give us salaried employment." But surely that method was the wrong one. England could make lasting restitution in one way only—by encouraging self-help, self-reliance, and the habit of industry. This itself meant money, but money was not the main necessity. What was needed was that Ireland should be put in possession of all the intellectual instruments by which she might revive old industries or create new ones. Let her receive the best industrial education, the most skilled advice that experts could furnish. Let no form of scientific experiment be grudged her. But no more fatal kindness could be done her than to give direct subsidies to set up ready-made industries. Instead of restoring industries it would merely paralyse the industrial spirit. Above all was this true in a country with a past like that of Ireland, where it had become only too habitual to look to the State for everything. That policy of doles was a policy of pauperisation. It was bad enough to have killed Irish industries in the past by selfish greed; still worse would it be, with mistaken good intentions, to kill out the newly-born spirit which Sir Horace Plunkett and his Department have fostered—the spirits of self-reliance, self-respect, and self-help.

Mr. CLANCY said that listening to the hon. Member they must come to the conclusion that he was not so much a statesman as a University don addressing University students. The more they heard of him the less they liked him. He wished to protest against one or two expressions which the hon. Gentleman used which involved a gross misrepresentation of the facts of the present situation. The hon. Member had spoken of the policy of Sir Horace Plunkett having had the effect of developing the will power and helping the self-respect of the Irish people. The Irish people had far more self-respect than England had been able to destroy, and if she had not more to-day it was due to the system of Government of which the right hon. Gentleman was so enamoured. The hon. Member spoke of doles having been made to Ireland by this Parliament.

Mr. BUTCHER: I did not say anything about this Parliament.

Mr. CLANCY said the hon. Member had referred to doles, and if he did not refer to this Parliament he referred to other Parliaments. He denied that the British Parliament had ever given doles to Ireland. Doles implied something given out of the funds of England, and through the generosity of England, to which Ireland had no right. From the Act of Union down to the present time Ireland had not obtained anything of the sort, and every penny she had obtained was money of her own; and not only that, England fraudulently retained from Ireland millions more to which she had no title. It was a strange thing to hear such statements even from an Anglicised Irishman, when the late leader of the Unionist Party, Colonel Saunderson, and the majority of that Party and Mr. Lecky repeatedly endorsed the view which he had expressed. It was an insult to the Irish people to have such statements launched at them as were made by the learned professor to whom they had just listened. He resented the often repeated statement, that there was local government in the Department, and that the expenditure was in the hands of the Agricultural Board. The truth was that there could be no expenditure without the approval and consent of the head of the Department. If he did not agree with an estimate the money went back to the reserve fund. The Board had no real authority at all in the matter of expenditure, and it was humbug to talk of their having it. They were always treated once or twice a year to a grand discussion which was fully reported in the papers at the meetings of the Agricultural Councils, but in those Agricultural Councils, which might be attended with useful results, there had been a procedure which he hoped the present head of the Department would not continue. As he had said, these meetings might be useful if members of the body were allowed to discuss matters fully. But, first of all, they had a long address from the President, Sir Horace Plunkett, which he had previously prepared at the expense of the Department, and then instead of allowing the Councils to discuss the subjects mentioned in that address, what did the President do but put up one of his underlings, whom he had previously inspired, to read a paper on an abstract subject, such as tillage *versus* grazing, upon which discussion was invited, but the really useful matters were scarcely touched upon, and there was no time in which to discuss them. The fact was that the Agricultural Department had become an annexe of Dublin Castle, and ought in its present position to be wiped out. One would imagine that local committees like that of County Dublin would be able to discharge their own business without the assistance of these great and mighty authorities set up in this Agricultural Department and overlooking the whole sphere of agriculture. Such committees were not, however, allowed to decide upon such matters as the salary of their own secretary, and the whole idea of the Department entertained by the hon. Gentleman seemed to be absolutely wrong. The main ideas of the Department appeared to be co-ordination and education. After they had co-ordinated, however, they would not obtain the object of the organisation. The first idea seemed to be that they should have a complete staff in every Department with telephones in every room, complete command of the telegraph and means of instructing their subordinates, and then gather back the network into one organisation. That seemed to be the end and aim of the whole organisation as far as he could gather, but at present so long as they had inspectors appointed to go round and report on something which they did not understand the effect was futile. He did not accuse Sir Horace Plunkett or anybody else of insincerity, but the fact seemed to be lost sight of that the real object of the Board should be to provide employment for the people. They might do it directly or they might do it indirectly, and the Act allowed subsidising of rural industries. What was the use of Irish technical education and nothing else? He was in favour of education, but the result of the technical education now given was that those who received it left the country because they could not find employment. When they had educated the people they had no work for them to do, and they took their technical knowledge to America and elsewhere. It was said that they wanted education and co-ordination, and no doubt they did, but above all the one thing that was necessary was to provide employment in the country, and the Chief Secretary ought to be very careful indeed how he employed this £30,000. Let him point out at the same time that it would not do to be merely educating and spending money on education. The hon. Gentleman said he was not allowed to do anything more in the region of technical instruction, because that was the law. If that was the case, then the sooner the law was altered the better. But apart from that, it was a fact that the law did not extend to the region of agricultural and rural industries, and what he wanted to know was, would the hon. Gentleman inquire why there was not more solid work done in that region in the way of creating, and, if necessary, subsidising industries? He agreed that the hon. Gentleman ought to be very careful not to compete with existing industries. That ought not to be done. It had, however, been done by the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, which had most audaciously attempted to become the rival of certain branches of trade in the country. But apart altogether from those doubtful experiments and inexpedient devices, there was room for good, solid real work, not merely by education, in helping the agricultural community in Ireland to save itself. He thought the hon. Gentleman would probably do more to recommend his administration to the good will of the Irish people if he changed the system inaugurated by Sir Horace Plunkett, and devoted more money and time to creating industries, where he was allowed by law to create them, provided he did so within proper limits, and less and less time in training people for foreign countries.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that, though an English Member, he was not debarred from taking some part in this debate. He had the deepest interest in those economic questions connected with Ireland which were, or ought to be, primarily the subject of discussion on an occasion like the present. He frankly doubted, interesting as was the statement of the hon. Member in charge of the Department, whether the debate, so far, had shown very clearly either what was the policy of the Government or what hon. Members below the gangway believed should be the Government policy. Some time had been devoted, and devoted very ill, to criticising Sir Horace Plunkett. He did not mean by that the hon. Gentleman had done anything in that direction to which he raised the smallest objection. [AN HON. MEMBER: We did not first introduce his name.] It was quite true that his hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University had first mentioned the name of Sir Horace Plunkett, but if all the references to that gentleman had been in the tone and temper of the observations of his hon. friend he certainly should not complain of the tone of that criticism. He thought himself that most scant justice had been done by Irishmen to the work of an Irishman, undertaken undoubtedly in the most unselfish spirit, carried through with the most persistent energy, and directed, at all events, by a perfectly clear idea of the ends to be attained and the means of attaining them, through many years of consistent work. The policy which Sir Horace Plunkett and the Board of which he was so long the distinguished head endeavoured to carry through was a policy of education, which should direct the energy of the Irish agriculturist in channels through which a wider experience than was open to the ordinary Irish farmers and agriculturists, as shown in other countries, could bring great wealth to an energetic and instructed population. No one would deny that Sir Horace Plunkett had striven consistently to carry out that aim. This policy had undoubtedly been successful in other countries, not only prosperous industrial communities, but actual rivals of Ireland in the markets of Great Britain and Ireland in the very products with which Ireland ought to establish her position. That plain and undoubted fact was borne on the face of the majority Report which had been referred to. How anyone could lay down that education in that sense was not a most hopeful way of increasing agricultural wealth and prosperity in Ireland passed his comprehension. The hon. and learned Gentleman who had just addressed the House was indignant with his hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University because he advanced the proposition, surely not a dangerous one, that it was better for the ultimate interests of Irish agriculture that they should be promoted by a system of education largely conceived than by a system of doles. The hon. and learned Gentleman had immediately got up and said that it was a monstrous suggestion; there never had been such a thing as a dole by England to Ireland, because England had always owed Ireland a great deal more money than she had paid to her, and, therefore, though the British Chancellor of the Exchequer might open his purse strings, England would never be able to liquidate the debt which had been for centuries accumulating. In other words, the hon. and learned Gentleman, objecting to the word doles, dragged, quite gratuitously, into a debate on Irish agriculture the vexed question of the financial relations between England and Ireland. His hon. friend clearly was not referring to doles from England to Ireland, but to grants of public money generally. His point was that they would not improve the economic condition of Ireland by doles of public money. He wished to know whether the Government differed from him, and whether they agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman below the gangway.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not ask for doles.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would drop the word "doles," and use the word "subventions," which meant the same thing, though it was a longer and less injurious phrase which he would use for the remainder of his argument. The Government had not given as clear a lead upon this subject as he should have liked to have from gentlemen of well-known economic views. The hon. Gentleman in charge of the Department had tried to give the go-by to the question by saying that, whatever his own views or those of his colleagues or a Committee might be, it did not come before this Committee of Supply, because the Department under discussion was specifically forbidden, by the Act establishing it, from giving a subvention in aid of industries other than those strictly agricultural. That was an ingenious way, and might, a few weeks ago, have been a valid way of getting out of the difficulty. It was clearly not valid now that a new principle and practice had been established. It was well known that the Government were going to give this year £100,000 of Irish as well as of English and Scottish money, directly in the teeth of an Act of Parliament, for the purpose of carrying out an object, good or bad, in connection with education in England. A Government which would do that in connection with the education fund for England were clearly not precluded from giving what they pleased in Committee of Supply in subvention of any industry in Ireland or elsewhere. The legal barricade which the hon. Gentleman sought would have been an admirable protection a month ago, but it had been blown up and ruined by his right hon. friend the Minister for Education. When he heard part of the hon. Gentleman's speech in which he sheltered himself behind this he ventured to make a small interruption indicating the argument which he was now respectfully developing. What said the hon. Gentleman? The hon. Gentleman said the Government was in watertight compartments. How were they to deal with a Government in watertight compartments? What arguments could be addressed to a member of a Government who said, "I agree these are the opinions of a colleague of mine, but in my watertight compartment we have a different principle"? It was perplexing to find consciences so different as those of the Vice-President and the Minister for Education. The one said that in his Department they broke the law, but the other was more scrupulous in his watertight compartment, and was obliged to tell hon. Members below the gangway that it was not even necessary for him to discuss a question they raised, because the law, which was so easily overcome by his right hon. friend, prevented him. He hoped the Chief Secretary would mediate between his two colleagues and tell the Committee in which watertight compartment he found himself, so that it might be known whether he would follow the policy of strict legality favoured by his Irish colleague or the looser principles and the happier and easier methods of the Minister for Education. He was not merely attempting to gain a Parliamentary score. His point was really an important one, because if the legal difficulty raised did not exist, as he had shown it did not, the hon. Gentleman was bound to answer the question, did he, or did he not, think that the policy of giving subventions to industries in Ireland was the way to repair the wrongs which 130 years ago, or earlier, England did to Ireland. He had never attempted to minimise those wrongs, though he was bound to say that the interesting historical preface of Mr. Micks put only one side of the question. Whether Ireland would have been happier had she been separated from England, she would certainly have suffered almost as much from the jealous commercial policy which was in favour in every civilised country.

MR. FLYNN: It was done by statute, not by competition.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was for that reason that he did not lay down the proposition unreservedly. There were some statutory iniquities, but he thought the chief operative cause of the injury to Ireland was the policy of commercial jealousy universally prevalent at the time. He did not think anybody could fairly understand the relations between England and Ireland unless they studied the relations between England and Scotland. A great many of the phenomena complained of in Ireland appeared before the Union and after in the connection between England and Scotland, and the reason why it was useful to study the question in reference to Scotland was that in Scotland there were none of those religious differences which were such a horrible addition to the inherent difficulties of the situation. It was possible that after the Union Ireland might have suffered by being joined to a free trade country like England when she might have liked protection herself. Many Irishmen took that view and Mr. Micks took it, but he did not know whether that was the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite. At all events Ireland had not suffered since the Union from any deliberate fiscal injury like those of which she justly complained before the Union. He greatly doubted himself whether, Ireland having had the same advantages, broadly speaking, as any other part of the kingdom for 107 years, they could attribute so much weight as Mr. Micks attributed to the iniquitous policy which came to an end in 1800. How many countries had developed great industrial prosperity, not in 100 years but in a couple of generations? He thought it was folly to say that there had been anything in the condition of Ireland to make it impossible for her to have done the same; indeed, it had been done in Belfast, and he never could see why that which had been done in Belfast could not be done elsewhere. He did not himself believe that the difficulties from which Ireland had suffered could be attributed simply to the fact that she was an island without coal or iron, and that she was subjected to oppressive fiscal legislation 130 years ago. Did this free trade Government and hon. Gentlemen opposite who represented England think with hon. Gentlemen below the gangway that it was by the subvention of industries that Ireland was to be made prosperous? When they proposed to govern Ireland according to Irish ideas, was that one of the ideas which they proposed to employ? He thought they had a right to know from the Government and the Chief Secretary whether it was so or not. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: "What is your idea?"] His own idea was that Sir Horace Plunkett was probably right when he said that the way to deal with Irish agriculture, at all events in the South and West, was the way in which Danish agriculture had been dealt with—the means by which Denmark was made, for its size, almost the most prosperous community in Europe, a process which was in the main due to education.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Then you are against subventions?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I certainly do not see any plan of subventions to aid industries on a large scale.

MR. CLANCY: The Act of 1899 authorises subvention in the case of agricultural and rural industries.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that that was perfectly true. He thought it was probably right to draw the words of the Act so that the Board of Agriculture might have the freest hand in dealing with these industries, and he supposed providing proper sires was a form of subvention. If he were asked whether they could really turn Ireland from an agricultural community into a manufacturing community, and do that healthily and successfully by means of subventions, he would say that he regarded it as a chimerical project. He asked either the hon. Gentleman who had already spoken or the Chief Secretary to give the Committee a perfectly clear lead as to the intentions of the Government upon what was the only question that interested them for the future—namely, the policy of the Agricultural Board, not as it had been since its establishment, but as it was to be under the new *régime*.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for the City of London commenced by stating that he had not indicated clearly any alternative policy. Did the right hon. Gentleman imagine that he went to the Department to upset Sir Horace Plunkett's policy? What reason had he in anything the Government had said or done to imagine anything of the kind? He would tell the right hon. Gentleman what he had in his mind in regard to policy. He had never been among those who had undervalued the work of Sir Horace Plunkett. The policy of Sir Horace was assailed only once in this House, and he spoke in favour of it, and voted for it, and lost no opportunity of expressing his opinion regarding it. Sir Horace Plunkett's work was an admirable beginning. The Department he established was essentially a great Department, and they were bound to speak of him well for what he had done. He had not become Vice-President for the purpose of upsetting the policy pursued by the Department. His duty was to extend and consolidate its work wherever he found it to be on proper lines, and to amend it where it was not. For example, the poultry scheme had been sneered at by some people, but the difference between the export of eggs from Ireland in 1905 and in 1906 amounted to £355,000. That was not a small matter for a country like Ireland, and it was due to the work of the Department. The breed of poultry had enormously improved, and in a country like Ireland that was a great matter for the small farmer. The Department was now engaged in collecting figures of imports and exports for Ireland. Nothing of the kind had been done before, but he rejoiced that it had been done, and as they were official figures they would carry weight. He had mentioned the poultry scheme in order to show that the Department did help the small farmer. Complaint had been made that the work of the Department was principally educational. He would speak perfectly frankly on the question of technical education. When this Department was started would anyone deny that technical education had practically no existence in Ireland? Surely his hon. friends could not complain of a Department that had done its best with insufficient funds to develop technical education. Let them not run right in the face of facts and knock their heads against a stone wall. In technical education the work done had been invaluable. In many towns technical institutes were to be found springing up. The Department had given an incentive to all these where they had not contributed and they had contributed to many. That work was necessary if the people of Ireland were to hold their own in the battle of life. The agricultural schemes were educational to a certain extent. He instanced the question of horse breeding. There was not much chance of getting unanimity on that subject. At all events he could say that an enormous improvement had taken place in the breed of horses in the last seven or eight years. He could give an example of that. He went to county Mayo the other day and the motor startled every horse they met. He was there twenty years ago and then it would have taken an earthquake to startle a single horse. What was true of horses was true of all kinds of cattle. The breed of cattle had enormously improved, and that was due to the Department in supplying sires. All that was absolutely necessary. They had been told that Denmark was Ireland's great competitor in butter, but Denmark owed everything to education.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): And free government.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that he did not know about the government, but he had studied the question of education, and he ventured to say that the position of Denmark was very largely the result of the education given by the State in agricultural matters.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): In colleges and not by itinerant instructors.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said it was perfectly fair to ask whether itinerant teaching had not been carried too far and whether the education ought not to be given in colleges and schools, but what he said was that this education had been necessary in the past, but it did not follow that that itinerant teaching would be necessary on the same scale as during the past year or two. But education they must have if the agricultural industry was to be a success. He had been twitted because he had not given a very clear explanation of the views of the Department with regard to the question of subsidising industries. The right hon. Member for the City of London wanted to know if he (Mr. Russell) was content to stand behind the legal barricade of the Act of 1899. What would the right hon. Gentleman like him to do? Would he like him to break the law? The Act of 1899 forbade him to subsidise industries other than rural industries. Mr. Micks wanted a million a year for an indefinite period outside the control of Parliament. Might he ask the right hon. Gentleman if he was in favour of Mr. Mick's scheme.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he should like to ask whether, if a clause in an Act of Parliament prevented the Government from voting a certain sum of money, they ought not to stick consistently to that. If they did not think that the clause prevented them they ought not to quote the Act of Parliament as forbidding them.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said the Act of Parliament forbade the Department to expend money upon the subsidising of industries other than rural industries. He intended to obey that Act of Parliament until it was altered. [Ironical cries of "Oh!"] Well, he had never yet broken an Act of Parliament, so far as he was aware. [A Member on the OPPOSITION BENCHES: McKenna would not.] He was in favour of getting every farthing from England for Ireland that he could get. And in getting it he did not think that Ireland was getting any favour at all. He held the same opinion as to the question of the financial relations between England and Ireland that was held by the majority of the Irish people and by the Royal Commission. In view of England's past and the way she had strangled Irish manufactures, Ireland had a moral claim upon her. The right hon. Gentleman thought that England had always been right since the Union. The Royal Commission did not think so.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not refer to the financial relations between England and Ireland. On that point he knew they held views different from those of the hon. Gentleman. What he referred to was the fiscal relations.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that he was a free trader himself and he was not in favour of interference with industries. But at the present moment they were engaged in Ireland in more ways than one in absolutely remaking many things. Everything had been thrown down. Everything had been neglected, and now their task was slowly and painfully to rebuild it. There had been free traders—notably Mr. John Stuart Mill — who had considered that bounties under certain circumstances were permissible. He personally was a free trader, pure and simple, and he could only say that whenever he got a chance within the Act of Parliament of assisting rural industries, he would avail himself of it, even at the expense of education. He hoped he should take nothing away from educational funds that was necessary. It was to be remembered that when the Congested Districts Board was established in 1891—the right hon. Gentleman was a free trader then—he gave the Board absolute power to promote and subsidise industries in the West of Ireland. As he had only been two months in office he could not be expected to marshal all facts, but at present there were 320 young men and women in Ireland going all over the country engaged in teaching the people. If there were any abuses they should be corrected. He was grateful to the hon. Gentlemen below the gangway for the fairness with which they had treated him. In this work he would be glad of the assistance of hon. Members, and he would not be deterred from his work because some hon. Members might see him walking through the lobby with Nationalist Members. After all, the Nationalists were the representatives of the great majority of the people, and he would be most glad of their counsel. He had undertaken a great work under very peculiar circumstances, and whatever happened he would do his best to serve Ireland while he remained in office.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he wished to say a word on one particular matter in which he was interested. The Leader of the Opposition had stated that they had never had anything to complain of in Ireland since the Union. But in 1831 an Act of Parliament was passed prohibiting what was then a very promising industry —the growing of tobacco. He contended that that was a gross injustice to Ireland. If the right hon. Gentleman referred to the records of Parliament for the year 1830, he would find the proceedings of a Committee composed of gentlemen who were Unionist in politics, and Protestant in religion, in which a strong protest was entered against any interference with tobacco-growing in Ireland. However, that promising industry was crushed by the Act of 1831. He appealed to the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture to give full and fair play to the attempts which were being made in different parts of Ireland to give employment to young men and women in tobacco-growing and curing. He knew that it was a dangerous thing to be seen talking to a Minister, after the speech of the hon. Member for North Armagh, who rated Mr. Bailey for probably asking a Nationalist Member for a cup of tea on the terrace. He himself never saw a Minister in private; but in public he would ask the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Tyrone, who had come freshly in his Department, to give every opportunity for the encouragement of tobacco growing in Ireland. He had found in one district between thirty and forty young men and women who had been employed all through the winter months in tobacco curing and sorting. He knew that some hon. Gentlemen in Ireland were rather inclined to look with incredulity on the possible success of tobacco cultivation there, but all he asked the hon. Gentleman was to give it fair play.

*MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) said that he offered his congratulations to the hon. Member for South Tyrone on the manner in which he had aquitted himself in a very delicate duty that afternoon. He thought, however, that the new Vice-President in the course of his interesting statement did not mention that according to the Report recently issued that young Department had already 43,590 students in Ireland. That surely was a record of which any Department might be proud. These students belonged to every class. The technical side had been pursued with success quite equal to that of the agricultural side. Sir Horace Plunkett had always carried out his work on the highest grounds apart from party feeling, and with the one desire of benefiting the country in all he did. There had been complaint as to the appointments he had made, but it must be remembered that at the beginning young men with the qualifications required were not in the country, and they had to go to England and Scotland for them. Let it not be forgotten, however, that even in making these appointments the local committees had the largest share. He might claim to know something of the work done, and he must say he had never known Sir Horace Plunkett, in spite of the great powers he held, override the nominations of one of these local committees. The Committee to which reference had been made was composed of five members, and four of those gentlemen, after careful inquiry, agreed that the Department came through the ordeal to which they submitted it with very great credit not only to the officials but to its chief. He regretted that it was only the Minority Report which had interested Nationalist Members, and he regretted still further that the new Vice-President had found it so much more interesting than the Majority Report, judging by his repeated references to it. The reason for his greater interest in the Minority Report appeared to be that Mr. Micks its author had dealt with nothing but the alleged weak points of the work of the Department. The whole of the Minority Report was carping and ungenerous in tone, and it showed a strong desire to minimise and belittle the work of the Department. He felt that this Minority Report by an unknown man dealing with the work of one who deserved so well of his country as Sir Horace Plunkett was not likely to be long remembered or to have the slightest effect in the direction of weakening the good effects of the seven years of hard and strenuous work which Sir Horace had done. Sir Horace was one of those men who did things without saying much about them. He was surprised that Sir Horace had been so criticised, for no less than ten Nationalist Members had been working harmoniously with him, and had given him great assistance in carrying out the work of the Department. Criticism of the Department implied criticism of those Members. He regretted what had been said about the Agricultural Organisation Society. That Society was the first work that Sir Horace Plunkett put his hand to, and it had now at work in the country 900 co-operative societies with 90,000 members. It was evident that the opposition nominally against that Department was really opposition to the line upon which the Department had been conducted by Sir Horace Plunkett. He was glad that nothing had fallen from the new Vice-President indicating that he was going to tear up the Department's present lines and work it as many of his Nationalist friends would like him to do. He hoped the Vice-President would with that care and discrimination which he possessed think twice and go slowly and cautiously before he altered, even in minor matters, the present schemes which he had found at work. It could not be doubted that the money at present granted to the Department was not adequate. The use of the present funds could not be criticised. The Department was getting full value for the money. County councils and urban district councils had made contributions towards the work of the Department to the amount of £55,000 a year. That money was raised all over the land. There was not a single county in Ireland that had refused to fall in with the schemes of the Department. There could be no finer tribute to the work which had been done by the Department than the fact that this assistance had been given to it and this large sum of money raised locally.

*MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) hoped that the warnings which the inclement spring had given would not be forgotten by the Department. The authorities were far too apt to allow things to drift for a long time until famine came, and then to rush into ill-conceived relief measures which involved the waste of public money. He trusted that the Department would, therefore, devote itself to the consideration of what measures should be taken to meet the possibility of similar pestilence another year. The Vice-President would do well to keep in close touch with the people of the localities in connection with the matter. It was most desirable to enlist their interest in the work of the Department. As to the position of the Vice-President, it was obvious that unless the Vice-President was in close touch with Parliamentary work many of the most necessary adjustments for which legislation was required must necessarily fall into arrear. But if the Department, as under the Council's Bill, was transferred to Dublin, there was no use in keeping the Vice-President at Westminster. He was not in agreement with some of his colleagues with regard to the relations between the Agricultural Department and the Agricultural Organisation Society. He was a firm and unrepentant believer in the virtue of co-operation. He entirely agreed with the Vice-President that the work which Sir Horace Plunkett did before he went to the Department as an organiser of co-operation in Ireland was beyond all praise. As a Minister he had never had very great admiration for him; but now that he had become once more a private person he and the Members on both sides would be content to allow personal issues to pass into oblivion. He had always been, although on the committee of the Agricultural Society, against subsidies. He believed them in the long run to be thoroughly bad for co-operation. If co-operation was to succeed it must do so free from Government interference, and free from any suspicion of being used as a political instrument or the tool of a Government Department.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) said he rose to call attention to a point quite foreign to agriculture, but which was at the same time connected with the Department represented by the right hon. Gentleman. Last year a Question was asked with regard to the contribution which was made to Scotland for the protection of the fisheries and the action taken by His Majesty's ships in following the trawlers. The Gentleman who spoke for the Scottish Office said that the Admiralty were going to withdraw the assistance they had given in this matter. He hoped that was not so, because the ships which now did their duty were wanted. The point he wished to press on the hon. Gentleman was that the Irish Members had over and over again asked for assistance to protect the fisheries of Ireland, and that assistance had been refused by the Admiralty. At present the Admiralty had only two gunboats at their disposal for this purpose, but eight years ago they had four, and he asked the hon. Gentleman to press the Admiralty upon this point. He also desired to ask whether the hon. Gentleman charged with the Fisheries Department of this country could not take into consideration the trawling question. It was notorious that during late years the yield of the North Sea had fallen 30 per cent., and great quantities of miniature fish were destroyed by these trawlers which trawled 1,500 square miles every day. At present, line fishing was most unprofitable on the coast of Ireland, and he asked the serious attention of the Government to that matter. The Dutch Government suggested a few years ago that the territorial water limit should be extended to twelve miles, and England appeared to favour that idea, but could not get the other Powers to regard it as an advantage. But such was the scarcity now of fish in the North Sea and elsewhere, that the majority of the supplies landed in this country came from the Portuguese Coast, and from as far as Morocco. These were matters of great moment, and could not be decided by the Department over which the hon. Gentleman presided, but at the same time he thought they were subjects that should be gone into by his Department in connection with other questions, because they were of vast importance, not only to sea fisheries, but he believed also largely to the inland fisheries of the country. He knew that the hon. Gentleman was pertinacious and pugnacious, and he was sure that in advocating their cause the Vice-President would approach the Admiralty in his pugnacious spirit, for there was nothing to be got out of them by obsequiousness; and he ventured to hope that the result of the hon. Gentleman's taking office would be that he would gradually and with success effect the protection and improvement of this industry.

MR. KILBRIDE asked whether the hon. Gentleman was in favour of local colleges instead of itinerant instructors.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL was understood to say that the matter was being considered, and he added that the Government were under an obligation, according to arrangement, to withdraw this Vote and bring on the Chief Secretary's Vote.

MR. J. P. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said that, as Lord Mayor of Dublin, he wished to express his feeling of satisfaction at the statement which the hon. Gentleman had made in reference to a matter that had been in dispute between the Dublin Corporation and the Agricultural Department of the Government. He welcomed that statement, and on behalf of the corporation he begged to thank the hon. Gentleman for the manner in which the matter had been dealt with.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he understood that the Government were under an obligation to withdraw the Vote. He wanted them to understand that he was not under any obligation. He protested last year against this being done, and insisted on the closure being moved, and he wished to renew that protest. He did not agree with this practice, which was adopted for the first time last year. He would not, however, stand in the way of the Government's carrying out the arrangement they had made, although he must safeguard himself by protesting against this practice which had been established against his protest, and certainly must not be allowed to grow into a precedent.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) said he must raise his protest against the hon. and learned Member for Waterford's attitude. The Members from the North of Ireland, though of different politics from those of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, were entitled at all events on one occasion during the year to have their grievances considered in Committee of Supply, and he was quite sure that the hon. and learned Gentleman would see that they had some right to consideration, and should be allowed at least one occasion for discussion of the questions they desired to bring forward

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that of course hon. Members from all parts of Ireland were entitled to bring forward their grievances. Nobody objected to that at all. On every occasion when Irish Estimates had been discussed Members from the North of Ireland had taken a very large part in the debate. The custom which was invariably carried out by the right hon. Gentleman himself when he was Chief Whip of his Party was to allow them to fix a particular Vote to be taken. That arrangement had been broken for the first time last year. The Government were under an obligation this year, and he would not stand in the way of their carrying it out, but it must be understood that he was not a party to it.

Vote agreed to.

Resolution to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £17,756, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices of the Chief Secretary in Dublin and London, and of the Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums, and Expenses under the Inebriates Acts."

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had raised his protest against time being given to Unionist Members from Ireland. A total of three days he believed was allocated under the Standing Orders to Irish Supply, and he desired to enter his emphatic protest against what had been advanced by the hon. and learned Gentleman. It seemed to him laughable to hear any Member of the Nationalist Party trying to criticise the Government in this matter. It was true that Nationalist Members until last year had selected what Votes were to be taken in the three days allotted to Irish Supply, but the Committee must realise that the situation had altered between then and now. A Unionist Government was then in office, and the Nationalist Members were the Opposition; it was, therefore, natural and perfectly proper that the Nationalist Party should have every opportunity of choosing what Votes should be discussed. A Radical Government was now in power, and was in close alliance if not fusion with the Nationalist Members, and for the Prime Minister, the Chief Secretary, or anybody else to tell them that hon. Members below the Gangway were in Opposition was absurd. The true opposition to the Government's policy came from the Unionist Members for the North of Ireland, and from a purely mathematical point of view, they were entitled to at least one of the three days during the session. In almost every division throughout the session Unionist Members for Ireland had voted against the Government, while Nationalist Members had voted with the Government. In these circumstances it was perfectly futile and absurd to say, as the Prime Minister did the other day, and as no doubt the Chief Secretary would say to-night, that the Nationalist Members were the real Opposition, and were the persons who had the first claim to say which Votes should be discussed. He protested strongly against that view, and he would renew his protest on every occasion until Unionist Members from Ireland had a fair share of the allotted three days. Having entered that protest, he would submit that the most important of the Irish Votes was that for the Chief Secretary's Office. The questions which had been raised that day did not in any way approximate in importance to the questions which could be raised on the Chief Secretary's salary, and in former days, he thought he was right in saying that that Vote was given a full day according to the invariable practice which had existed for fifteen or twenty years since the system of allotted days came into force. But now, on the third of the three allotted days, more than one half had been given up to subjects which no doubt were important, but which could not be considered as of anything like the importance of the Chief Secretary's Vote. It was too late apparently this session to do anything, but he hoped that next session hon. Members opposite would be impressed with the reasonableness of the claim of Unionist Members for the North of Ireland. So important was the Vote they were about to discuss that every year there should be a day for the discussion of the Chief Secretary's salary without the necessity of asking anyone to put it down. The Prime Minister indicated the other day that he could not move from the decision he had come to in regard to this Vote. Up to that time he had the idea that the administration of the Government in Ireland would form a definite vote of censure, but to-day it appeared very doubtful whether they would get that opportunity at all. He had been expecting to have the opportunity of placing his grievances before the House on that occasion, and he confessed that, so large was the field to be covered and so many were the details, he was not now in a position to enter into the subject in the way he should have been ready to do had they been given a whole day for the purpose. He wished to protest against the very short time which had been given to them to discuss these matters. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: You have the House to yourself now.] For a long time they had been laying up bad marks against the Government which they hoped to be able to deal with more fully than was possible at Question time. The serious indictment they wished to bring against the Government could not be put by one Member. He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the question of the Bann drainage. This was a question which had been brought before the Committee repeatedly for the last fifty or sixty years. To Louth Neagh and the Bann and the counties affected the flooding was a very serious matter. Lough Neagh was the largest lake in the United Kingdom and its basin was of immense size. It was eighteen miles long and twelve miles broad. Around the lake there was a large quantity of low-lying land and there was only one river to carry off the water, whilst no less than twelve rivers flowed into Lough Neagh. In the year 1847 Parliament consented to carry out considerable works intended to remedy the undoubted damage done by the serious flooding which occurred in the low-lying districts around the banks of the lake and along the banks of the river Bann. That work was carried out by the Board of Works, but unfortunately the estimate of £109,000 was very much exceeded, and the time of carrying out the works coincided with the famine. Consequently much of the work was carried out as relief work, which was not economical, and instead of costing £109,000 no less a sum than £160,000 was spent. It was true that the Government remitted the difference between the original estimate and the actual cost, but whereas the work was estimated to take three years it took twelve years, and the amount of interest largely increased. Since that time no less a sum than £170,000 had been paid in respect of these works. For the first ten years those works were successful, but after that the damage from flooding began again, and it was now as bad as ever. The people who lived in those low-lying districts were led to believe that the large amount of money spent would cure the flooding, and they consented to pay the money, but subsequent investigation had shown that the works were not carried out as originally designed, and many obstacles still remained which impeded the free flow of the water. For the last twenty years they had been pressing the Government to remedy this state of things. Sir Alexander Binnie had reported that a complete cure of the existing state of things could be effected for £76,000. The Report which had recently been issued from Mr. J. D. Bell appeared to be rather against the claims which they put forward, because he said that if the original works were carried out completely the value of the land would only be £750 more. But the mere increase in money value was not everything, for he could produce extracts from medical officers' reports and others showing that the prevalence of this flooding caused very great injury to the health of the people in the counties affected, as well as to the crops of the farmers. He had seen at certain periods of the year about 7,000 acres under water. It was very fair tillage land, and only a few trees and the upper portions of cottages were to be seen above the water. A large number of people suffered severely every year from this cause. It was complained that on the Southern end of the Lake in counties Antrim, Tyrone, and Derry, and on the banks of the Bann itself a very considerable amount of land was affected in the same way. They had been buoyed up for years with promises of all sorts. It was impossible to collect statistics as to the annual losses affecting crops of hay, and it was equally impossible to get accurate figures as to injury to health, but that there was a very great injury to health especially in the autumn and late winter there could be no doubt. He trusted that the Chief Secretary would give the matter his very careful consideration in the hope that the Irish people would not see another Government coming in and going out of office without having done something to remedy a condition of things which all classes of Ireland wished to see improved. It was a pressing grievance, and if the right hon. Gentleman really wished to do what he could for the North of Ireland he would quickly attend to it.

MR. BIRRELL said that no one could be Chief Secretary for Ireland without hearing of the Bann and the Barrow. But past history did not always encourage one to indulge in expenditure on a drainage scheme. The hon. Member had pointed out that in 1847, £170,000 was spent on the drainage of the River Bann, in the hope that it would get rid of the damage occasioned by flooding the low banks, and that the Bann would thus recede from the dreams of succeeding Chief Secretaries. These works were comparatively successful, but for the last twenty years things were as bad as they were before. There had been engineers' reports on this subject, and Sir Alexander Binnie's had mentioned the sum of £170,000. The Government could not, however, be satisfied that this figure was in any way to be relied upon. Then there was Mr. Bell's report which was a little bit dispiriting. Mr. Bell made a careful survey of the land in the immediate neighbourhood of this river for whose benefit the work would be done, and he came to the conclusion after most careful inquiry that even if the money had been spent the total increase in the annual value would be only £750 a year. That would be a miserable return for the capital sum that would have to be expended. He did not consider that Report to be in any way conclusive on this matter, or as forbidding the Government if they got the money, from considering whether it could be usefully expended.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG stated that the area of the land amounted to 130,000 acres. The neighbourhood was thickly populated and the question of health was certainly important.

Mr. BIRRELL said he had no doubt that the question of health did come into consideration. It would undoubtedly require a very large expenditure of money, and he did not think £100,000 would be an adequate sum for the carrying out of Sir Alexander Binnie's Report. His tenure of office had not yet reached six months, and his difficulty was to get money from the Treasury, and, if he got a promise of money, to be perfectly satisfied that this was the best way to spend it. He did not wish to raise false hopes in the minds of hon. Gentlemen. It was not a Party question. It had nothing to do with religion. If he were addressing millionaires who wished to spend money usefully and agreeably he really honestly believed that they could not spend their money better than by employing it on the drainage of the Bann, and he hoped also the Barrow whose claims were just as great. It was also difficult to decide in Ireland between 100 rival schemes which was the best way to spend the money provided the Treasury granted it.

Mr. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.) said he wished to know whether the Chief Secretary had received any information from Belfast in regard to the progress of the strike there, and also in regard to the rather sensational incident which occurred last night when a meeting of the Royal Irish Constabulary was called and when there was a chance of mutiny. There was considerable feeling in Belfast in regard to the position of those on strike in their relationship to the police. The police had been instructed, he understood, to put every obstacle in the way of those engaged in the entirely legal occupation of picketing. He thought that the revolt which had taken place among the police was an indication that really the right hon. Gentleman would have to take some practical step to see that the forces of the Crown were not used entirely in favour of one of the parties to the dispute, but that they were called upon to act impartially. He wished to call attention to the appeals which had been made to the right hon. Gentleman to do his best. He was quite sure of the interest which the right hon. Gentleman had not only in the general welfare of Ireland, but in the progress and development of the great commercial and industrial capital of the north of Ireland. He would urge upon him with all the intensity he could the essential need for someone in a responsible position to exercise his influence in order to avert this crisis becoming greater and more intense and to bring about a settlement of the unfortunate situation now existing. The strike seemed to be developing as it was allowed to continue. He understood that arbitration would be accepted by the men engaged in the dispute. He did not propose to discuss the merits or the demerits of the strike. He simply wanted to say that not only were employers and employed suffering, but the general trade, and even people who were not directly or indirectly associated with the strike, were suffering. Widespread misery was caused to the masses of the people and great injury was being done to the industrial progress of the city itself. He knew that the Chief Secretary had most generously offered himself as arbitrator if both parties would accept him. He would like the right hon. Gentleman to try to devise some means by which the strike could be brought to a close. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would endeavour to think out some plan which, apart from the interest of the men and the employers, but in the interest of good government, would bring the strike, the continuance of which would be of the greatest danger to the city, to a close. He did not wish to prolong the discussion on the Chief Secretary's salary. The hon. Member for South Antrim had stated that the Ulster Unionists represented one-third of the inhabitants of the country. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would explain with that marvellous accuracy for which he was famous, the foundation for that statement. How could ten be a third of a hundred ?

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said he could explain. The Irish were divided into two parties—one-third Unionists and two-thirds Nationalists.

Mr. J. DEVLIN said that that was a most magnificent and profound explanation. It was only another example of the splendid powers of clear exposition of the hon. Gentleman. There were 103 Members for Ireland and there were ten Unionists from Ulster. He supposed the hon. Gentleman spoke for the ten, but none of the Ulster Unionist Members were present except the hon. Gentleman himself. Oh! yes; the leader of them, the right hon. Member for South Dublin, was present. That right hon. Gentleman had transferred his attractions from Bristol to South Dublin. The Ulster Members wanted not three hours but three days to discuss all the malversations of the Government, and when the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary came there to meet his assailants they heard nothing but a cold, if useful, speech from the hon. Member for South Antrim. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman was not the sensational Member of the Ulster extravaganza. He supposed the sensation was confined to the morning performance. The hon. and learned Member for North Armagh was formerly one of the Members for North Antrim, but the Unionists there found that his sensational attacks on the most vital public interests of the country were not the best form of representation they desired, and so he was transferred from an impartial arena to the more obscure arena of Portadown.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is getting away from the Motion before the Committee.

MR. J. DEVLIN said that at any rate there did not seem to be anybody troubling himself about the Chief Secretary. It seemed that someone should add to the gaiety of the evening, and why not he? He only regretted that the occasion had not been marked by some characteristic speech from the hon. and learned Member for North Armagh, because some of them had neglected their dinner to listen to such an effusion.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that the hon. Gentleman had amused the House as he always did, and had interested them with his eloquence. The hon. Gentleman had been good enough to refer to himself as transferring his services from Bristol to South Dublin. He was the victim of that policy with which the Government had been identified themselves, viz., the policy of compulsion. The hon. Gentleman had sacrificed his dinner in order to come and listen to the sensation of the evening, of the year, of the century! The hon. Member had been the victim, as many others had been, of sensational announcements or of his own imagination. He did not think there had been any suggestion of a sensational demonstration on that occasion. There was a general desire, not confined to Irish Members, that there should be an opportunity for discussing the Irish policy of the Government so far as that policy could be discussed. It was necessary that the Irish Vote should be divided into classes, and when they were discussing, say, technical education in Ireland they were limited in scope. The object they had in pressing for a discussion on the Chief Secretary's salary was that it was the only occasion on which they could review the whole policy of the Irish Government for the time being. When this Government came into office there was a considerable flourish of trumpets. The right hon. Gentleman was not then Chief Secretary, and there was considerable doubt as to whether any improvement had taken place in the condition of Ireland, or as to the advantages which would flow from the altered system of administration. They were told that there was to be an administration that would produce contentment and peace, and that such changes would be made as would entirely alter the relations between this country itself and Ireland. He did not think the Irish Government had been singularly fortunate in the efforts made in that direction. They had adopted the view that there was some middle course which might be taken that would satisfy the Irish people, and at the same time be in conformity with the wishes of the people of the United Kingdom. The Government had raised hopes in Ireland that they were going to deal with the government of the country, but when it came to the realisation of those hopes they had produced a plan which had been condemned almost before the ink was dry on the paper on which it was written. For his part his withers were unwrung. He had always held that there was no choice of a course between the two policies—Home Rule and the maintenance of the Union. That was proved by the untimely fate of the effort of the Government in the Irish Council Bill. Further, the Government had indicated their intention of dealing with the Irish University question, and they put an announcement in the King's Speech that they had arrived at a definite policy on the question, and were prepared to put it to the test. They had heard no more of that, except that the Prime Minister had stated that the Chief Secretary was to spend the autumn in Ireland to try and find a solution of the higher education question which would please all parties. In the Irish Council Bill they produced a plan which fell far short of what the Nationalists desired, and in regard to higher education they had to confess that they had to go back to find a solution. That was not a great record for the strongest Government of modern times. His hon. friend had said that there was some ground for complaint at the way in which the Vote for the Chief Secretary's salary had been treated, and he supported what his hon. friend had said in that regard. He did not remember any session in which the Chief Secretary's Vote had not been put forward in the very forefront of the Estimates, and given the fullest time for discussion. Why had the Vote not been put in its ordinary position on this occasion? It was because the wishes of the Irish Party had to be obeyed by His Majesty's Government. The Government had failed utterly to satisfy Nationalist Members with regard to legislation, but they had more than satisfied them by the methods and manner of their administration. The body who had been responsible for the government of Ireland would not hastily or rashly take action in that House which was likely to embarrass the Chief Secretary. He maintained that Mr. Bryce had left to his successor a legacy of trouble. He had left Ireland in such a position as to add greatly to the burden which the Irish Minister had to bear. Mr. Bryce had shown that there had been a steady and increasing improvement in the condition of Ireland during Unionist administration. He regretted that the present Chief Secretary had not thought it beneath his dignity, and the dignity of the great position he occupied, to make offensive charges against Unionist Members, when all they had done was to bring to the notice of the House, and to the notice of the Government of the day, evidence of the condition of things in some parts of Ireland which they believed was not receiving proper attention from the Government, and which they knew constituted a great danger to the people of Ireland, and to the security of the people who lived in those parts. Nationalists who were naturally at political warfare with Unionists——

MR. JOHN REDMOND: When we supported you, you were always glad to get our support.

MR. WALTER LONG said that they had more often than not been in political antagonism. Nationalists had charged Unionists with seeking to blacken the character of their countrymen because they had asked the Chief Secretary questions regarding events in Ireland the occurrence of which he had not been able in the vast majority of cases to deny. The Chief Secretary had in a few cases been able to show that the numbers of the crowd and the extent of the injury had been exaggerated, and he had taken full advantage of any such discrepancy as that. The Chief Secretary had had to admit that, in nine cases out of ten, the questions asked him had been based on fact, and that the efforts of the Government to deal with the trouble had failed. Could the right hon. Gentleman tell the Committee now, what his predecessor told them a year ago, that in all respects the condition of Ireland was better than it was twelve months ago; would he give the figures dealing with the various classes of offences which were peculiar to the part of Ireland involved, and which were no doubt due to those agrarian difficulties with which they were familiar? The right hon. Gentleman had more than once disputed the accuracy of and belittled their statements and treated them with contempt and ridicule. Would he deny that there was in parts of Ireland evidence of a condition of things which must be a discredit to the Irish Government and productive of the gravest anxiety and alarm to the people obliged to live in that country? Did he not get hundreds of letters from men and women, often in poor circumstances, compelled to live in their own homes or make great sacrifices if they left? Did he not receive letters telling him of the dangers under which they lived, and the dangers to which they were exposed, and begging for the protection of the Government, invariably ending as the letters he also had received with the pathetic and unfortunate prayer that, whatever was done on their behalf, let them not give way to the Nationalists that their condition might not be made worse than it was.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): They are forged letters.

MR. WALTER LONG said they were not forged letters. He would undertake that the great bulk of letters which he and other Unionist Members had received described the condition of the country. They were genuine letters written by people who truthfully described the condition of the country. He asked the Chief Secretary with his legal advisers beside him whether he believed the letters which he received were forged letters.

MR. BIRRELL said he did not suggest that there were not a number written of a perfectly genuine character, but as the right hon. Gentleman had challenged him he was bound to say that he was shown a number of letters purporting to be signed by different people and that a close examination showed that one man signed the whole.

MR. WALTER LONG said the right hon. Gentleman was entitled to make that reply and everybody knew perfectly well that in matters not connected with Ireland it was not unusual for one person to sign a number of letters or a number of names to a petition. But that was not his question to the right hon. Gentleman. His question was, did the right hon. Gentleman believe that these were forged or bogus letters.

MR. BIRRELL said he must decline all responsibility for the correspondence; no doubt many of the letters were genuine, but the right hon. Gentleman must not apply to him to give a character to the whole of them.

MR. WALTER LONG said he regretted that when the Committee were dealing with a matter of the gravest moment, when they represented what was common knowledge in the United Kingdom and was in the knowledge of anyone who had visited Ireland and seen the condition of things there, the right hon. Gentleman should throw this kind of discredit on the statements he (Mr. Long) had made. The right hon. Gentleman must know that men and women in the position of the writers of these letters could not allow their names to be made public, because their lives would be made intolerable. He asked whether there had been during the year an increase in agrarian offences, such as threatening letters, boycotting, and cattle-driving, and in the number of farms surrendered because the occupiers found it impossible to carry them on with safety to themselves and their families. A Minister, if determined to do so, could prevent these crimes, but it required strenuous efforts. Had the Chief Secretary a police force strong enough for the difficult work of the constabulary in the more lonely parts of Ireland? Was the right hon. Gentleman satisfied that the men in the force were sufficiently experienced? He had heard the police criticised in this House, and accused of partiality in the execution of their duties, but nobody who had not studied on the spot these difficult Irish questions could realise how difficult was the task which devolved upon the Royal Irish Constabulary. The right hon. Gentleman had failed to check this class of crime and failed to discover the perpetrators and bring them to justice. If it was shown that the police were insufficient in number or that there was an improper proportion of short service men among them the blame would rest not with the police but with those who were responsible for the disposition of the force throughout the land. If it was the fact that for a considerable period there had been an increase of this kind of crime, he maintained it was the first duty of the Government to put it down. Had the Government used all the powers at their disposal in order to cope with and put an end to this kind of crime? The Government had taken credit to themselves for not having had recourse to the Crimes Act of 1887, and yet they had availed themselves of a statute of Edward III. The Government at this moment were dealing with the Evicted Tenants Bill in order to remove one of the causes of Irish discontent, but he ventured to say that, whatever might be the method which they adopted, whatever legislation they passed to ameliorate the condition of the Irish people, there was at the same time a prevalent belief that lawlessness would be—he would not use the word permitted, but at all events that it would not be put down with a strong, firm, and determined hand. All their legislation for ameliorating the condition of the people was so much waste paper and must fail if they allowed the continuance of a condition of things which would of itself bring about the failure of their measures. He knew that hon. Gentlemen below the gangway had denounced their views as to the condition of Ireland, and pointed out that it was freer from crime than any other part of the United Kingdom. He was thankful to remember, as he had done on every occasion, that in the record of those crimes which they usually associated with the word "crime," Ireland was freer than other parts of the United Kingdom, and nobody was prouder than he was to bear in mind that record. Still, that was no excuse or justification for a condition of things in which the liberties of the people were interfered with, in which the ordinary avocation of a section of the people were made impossible, and in which there came the cry which they were compelled to voice on behalf of these people that there should be even-handed justice to all from the Government of the day, whatever might be the demands made on Parliament either for money or for legislation—demands which he believed would always be cheerfully met by Parliament in answer to petitions from the Irish people. Whatever might be the answer to those demands, unless, at the same time, every possible effort was made to secure for the Irish people real law and order, the Government of the day, however benevolent, would fail in their efforts. It was because they believed there was a demand for a stronger interference with those who were themselves interfering with the orderly and peaceful life of the people of Ireland, that they had asked for a discussion on this Vote, upon which alone the general administration of the Irish Government could be considered. In order that he might regularise the proceedings and to mark his view of the present situation in Ireland he begged to move the reduction of the Chief Secretary's salary by £100, and to assure the right hon. Gentleman that in doing so he did not want, far from it, to add to the difficulties that he knew too well that he had to face, nor to add to the burdens which he had to bear; but because he believed that it required more determination, more recognition of facts as they were, if they were successfully to cope with and to remove those difficulties which now stood in the way of the peaceful development of Ireland, and which so long as they existed were the curse of the lives of many of the Irish people.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Chief Secretary."—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

* Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said he did not want to take part in the general debate, but simply desired to support the hon. Member for West Belfast in the appeal he had made to the right hon. Gentleman as regarded the present dispute in that city. They had made this appeal before, and owing to the information they had to hand, they were very anxious that the right hon. Gentleman should do his very best in regard to matters that had arisen in Belfast. The people on strike were doing their very best to treat the dispute in the proper way, but they felt that the police were acting somewhat on one side. That was the feeling they had, and he thought the action of the police on the previous night indicated that the police themselves felt that they were not acting quite impartially. He did not want to put it any stronger than that. It was a question for the Belfast people themselves. They forwarded information, as the Labour Members had no means of obtaining the information for themselves, and they depended on what was sent to them. They had Englishmen in Belfast, persons whom they could trust, who had given them information which had conveyed to them the same impression as the information sent by the people of Belfast. The trouble being experienced in Belfast was one which was never thought about in this country. What was now occurring in Belfast at the present time was the sort of fight they used to have fifty years ago in this country. The question of recognising trade union officials ought never to be raised now. It ought to have been recognised long ago in Ireland, as

every employer of labour in this country with few exceptions, recognised it; it was a matter of every day business in this country, and he was inclined to think that there was something behind the dispute which the public had not realised. When one found that eight of the smaller companies had come to terms with the men and that only three of the larger railway companies were holding out, one was apt to wonder what they were driving at. When one knew that there was an agitation of railway men for recognition—for it was the only point which they were raising at present—and when one remembered that the railway companies of Ireland were fighting this point in Belfast, while the real fight was in this country, and that the weaker body there was having to bear the brunt of the struggle which it could be seen was coming in this country, it would be for the men of England to assist their fellow-workers in Ireland in obtaining a recognition of the principle for which they were fighting. He hoped that it was not true that the fight in Ireland was in anticipation of a fight in this country, but if it was true, then they realised that they must go to the help of those in Ireland who were fighting the big railway companies. The men had offered arbitration, and they would accept the right hon. Gentleman or anybody else chosen by him to act as arbitrator. Surely, they were not standing on their dignity. In the cotton trade disputes were settled by conciliation — six on each side — and they never thought of arbitration. But when arbitration was offered freely, the companies ought to accept it as the next best thing to conciliation. If this was the sort of treatment the Ulster Members were going to mete out to the Belfast people then the trade unionists in England were prepared to back the men of Belfast in their action. In all sincerity, however, they had no object to serve except the peace of Belfast. The men had a reasonable case, they were prepared to give it reasonable consideration, they were prepared to accept arbitration, and it appeared to him that the trouble that was going on ought not to be allowed to continue without protest. It was entirely in the hands of the employers to make peace in twenty-four hours, and when the workpeople were ready to go the length of settling this question it was time some protest was made against the action of the companies.

MR. GEORGE CLARK (Belfast, N.) said he rose to speak for the first time in that House, in support of the Motion for the reduction of the Vote. It was not because he grudged the Chief Secretary his £100 that he supported the motion, as he was fully alive to the fact that anyone who had anything to do with the administration of Ireland fully earned the salary that he got. Though he had the honour to represent an Irish constituency, he was not an Irishman, but a Scotsman born. He often regretted that he was not an Irishman, because he always envied the Irish people the ease and the fluency with which they were able to give expression to their ideas. He only wished that they had the Chief Secretary more often in Ireland; he wished that the right hon. Gentleman knew more about Ireland, or that he had lived there for some little time, because he was satisfied that he, like every other Britisher of his acquaintance, would become a Unionist. The two peoples they knew had no community of ideals or community of purpose. The Unionists were British to the core, and they were determined that at all costs Ireland should remain an integral part of the United Kingdom; whereas he was sorry to say the Irish Nationalists wished to have Ireland for the Irish alone, and they made no secret, in fact they were accustomed to boast in season and out of season, of their antipathy to Britain and everything British. There was one point on which he believed that the two peoples were in agreement, and that was in their cordial dislike of the present British Government. The Nationalists disliked him, although it suited them to appear to like him, because he was British, and Unionist disliked him because he was not British enough. They did not seem to have that sense of fair play which was associated with the British name all over the world. To the ordinary man the methods of the present Government in connection with both Ireland and England were past comprehension. They appeared to be trying to please everybody with the usual result that they were satisfying nobody. There was one thing which they were doing well, and that was that in the measures they had passed and were endeavouring to pass they had succeeded in setting class against class, creed against creed, capital against labour, landlord against tenant, Nonconformist against Churchman, and Protestant against Catholic. When he introduced the Irish Council Bill the Chief Secretary told them that Ireland was fairly peaceful and fairly loyal, and he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman in that. He had not the slightest doubt as to the result of English administration and British laws wisely and firmly administered. He regretted that British laws in Ireland were not now being administered as firmly as they ought to be. When British laws were wisely and firmly administered people were beginning to understand each other better, they appreciated each other's good qualities, and they paid less heed to that curse of Ireland, the agitator. The unfortunate strike in Belfast had been referred to by the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Belfast. He could assure the Committee that personally he was as anxious as anyone else that that strike should come to an end, because the suffering in Belfast in consequence of the strike was not pleasant to contemplate. But he failed to see how they could assist in bringing the parties together. Arbitration had been suggested, but before they could do that they had to get both sides to agree to that course. He returned from Belfast last night, and before he returned he went down to the docks and quays to see for himself the position of affairs. With regard to what had been said about peaceful picketting he saw over 200 men and more than half of them were armed with heavy sticks, and they were going about Belfast in that way at the present moment. [An Hon. Member: "That is not peaceful picketing."] Unless matters were handled differently there would be considerable trouble in Belfast, and he was sure the Labour Members would regret that result just as much as anyone else. He was glad to notice that the Chief Secretary had arranged that the authorities were to have all the help they required in maintaining law and order. If there was one thing which ought to be strictly maintained in Belfast it was law and order, and it was the duty of the Government to see that people were allowed to go about their business without molestation from anybody. The Chief Secretary had told them that Ireland was fairly prosperous and fairly loyal. There might be considerable trouble in Belfast unless the situation was judiciously handled. He was glad the authorities would have all possible help in maintaining law and order. If, as the Chief Secretary said, Ireland was fairly prosperous and fairly loyal, why not leave well alone? Did they want to raise hell again in the country? The Irish were a highly imaginative and excitable race, and it was not fair or just to lead them to expect things they could not possibly get. This might lead before many months were over to serious trouble.

Mr. BIRRELL said that, although he was glad to congratulate his countryman on the opposite side of the House on his very considerable gift of lucid speech, he was afraid, as Chief Secretary, he could not recognise in him a recruit who was likely to make his task any the easier: As to his own miserable salary, he could assure the hon. Member that whether they cut it down by £100 or altogether, if any good was to be done to Ireland thereby it was entirely at their service. With regard to the subjects that might fairly be discussed upon the Vote for the salary of the Chief Secretary, these might well occupy the attention of the House, not for a night, but for the six or seven years of a Parliament. There was the question of the health of Ireland. The figures with regard to that were simply terrifying, alike as touching consumption, tuberculosis, and the increase of lunacy. He had already stated the figures, which were they given of one of our Crown Colonies, of the West Indies or St. Helena, the conscience of the House would be so profoundly touched, its sense of duty would be so stirred, that it would, instead of treating them with comparative indifference, set to work to do something at once. It was the same with education, primary, intermediate, and University, the administration of the Poor Law, the position of piers and harbours, industry, and even their old friend the Bann. These were questions which might very fairly occupy the whole of more than one evening.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Why one evening?

Mr. BIRRELL: Why only one evening? Because they tried to do in the

Imperial Parliament work that ought to be done in Ireland by Irishmen themselves. Attention had been drawn to the condition of things in the West of Ireland. Lawlessness undoubtedly existed there; but it was a very small and limited question as compared with many other questions which he believed to be of greater importance—such as the questions affecting land, which had a sort of pre-emption and perpetual privilege in this House, as if it were alone a matter of primary importance. The reports he received from the police and other persons revealed the condition of Ireland generally as to peace and order as being very satisfactory. More than three-fourths of the country was free from serious ordinary crime—which was the worst crime—and agrarian crime. The Judges in the summer assizes had stated in their charges that they found the state of the country peaceable and orderly save in certain limited areas. He did not desire to underrate for a moment the importance of the question because the area to which acts of lawlessness were confined was limited. In Galway, Roscommon, part of Tipperary, part of King's County and Queen's County and Leitrim they found a considerable amount of disturbance. It was a mere accident under whose particular rule questions of this kind assumed greater or less importance. It was not due to the personality of the individual Chief Secretary; it was not due to the constitution of the particular British Government in power at the moment; it obeyed other laws and other considerations than that. He disclaimed the right of hon. Members opposite, therefore, to speak to him as if he were responsible for all that had been done in Ireland for the last 700 years, or as the personification of English rule. Nothing of the kind. He had been but six months in the Irish Office, and he had to deal with the situation which had been largely created by the House in the land legislation of the past thirty-seven years. Hon. Members might "motor" into Roscommon, and the sight they would see could not be equalled in any other part of the United Kingdom. Nothing but land for cattle, with a few habitations, and the people cramped into bog land not suitable for the grazing of beasts. He was not saying that the grazing of beasts was not a perfectly reasonable and lawful occupation. But he could say that the legislation of 1903 had imbued the minds of the Irish people with the idea that the desire was to transfer the land from the landlords to the tenants by voluntary arrangements in the first instance, and in 1903 British credit was drawn upon to an uncertain amount for the purposes of that voluntary arrangement. There was a convinced feeling among the people that sooner or later the tenants were to become the owners in fee of the soil which they cultivated. They could not expect that these poor people should be content for ever to live outside these lands which not long ago were tillage land supporting a population while their neighbours were owners of their own holdings. But the condition of things, as far as statistics were concerned, was not so satisfactory now as in Mr. Bryce's time. From a casual expression he had dropped some hon. Members seemed to imagine that he did not disapprove of cattle-driving. What was cattle-driving? It must be distinguished from cattle-lifting, so frequent in ancient border story. It was an intimidatory process, and, as such, it received no support of any kind or shape from him. It was not a predatory process. In former days cattle were not only lifted but murdered on the spot, which afterwards reeked with blood. The people did not steal the cattle. When one remembered the discontent in the minds of the people because they believed that Parliament was willing to transfer these lands to them were it not for the action of graziers, these deeds should not cause any great measure of surprise. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] Hon. Members might take a more exalted view of human nature, but he, at all events, did not live in those hyperborean regions, but regarded human nature as it really was. During the six months of the present year there had been forty-one cattle drives. They were illegal, of course, things to be put down, and the Irish authorities had done and would continue to do their very best to put them down. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] The graziers were for the most part butchers carrying on business in the neighbouring towns. He did not deny that they were amenable to pressure. As tradesmen, if they were exposed to unpopularity, they would lose their trade. Accordingly, they yielded to pressure, because their trade suffered. But what could the Irish Administration do with people who had feelings of that kind? It was said, "Use the forces of the law." They had used them, and were using them. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] There was not a single one of those persons who applied for police protection who had not received it. Wherever the authorities got information of an intended cattle drive, there they planted police. They had sent between sixty and seventy police into Galway, and an inspector and seventy-five men into Roscommon. But it was not possible on dark nights to have a policeman at the head of every one of these beasts. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh."] In the provision of extra police to protect these people the Irish Administration had considerably strained their reserves; but if further police were necessary to be recruited they would be recruited, and the force would be kept up at any cost to whatever strength it required in the discharge of its duties. But these graziers had grown so much into the habit of having police protection that they would do nothing to protect themselves. Often when the police gave them notice of a contemplated cattle-drive from their lands, they neglected to turn up to assist the police even in the most important work of the identification of the offenders. That was not the way business was done in this country. These people had learned to rely on the Irish Constabulary, and had neglected their own powers of defence and their own instincts of preservation. He would not say they should take firearms for their defence, but at least they should be there to assist the police against the ruffians of the neighbourhood and to identify their own property. In these matters the Government had done all they could in the way of protection, and this they would continue to give so far as circumstances would allow. But on a dark night over a wide area it was not always possible to prevent cattle-driving or to identify the people committing the offence amongst sympathising neighbours. It was always cowardly to assail an Administration for not always succeeding in a task in which he was quite sure hon. Gentleman opposite would have been not one whit more successful. Punitive proceedings were being taken under legal advice, and it must not be assumed that, because they did not always suceeed, and because sometimes the jury disagreed, they wholly disregarded the evidence, they could not say that unless they were present at, and took part in, the trial. The Government had put the ordinary law in force, and would continue to do so when advised there was a case to go to a jury, and in some cases a change of venue had been obtained. That was all he had to say upon cattle-driving, a serious offence he did not deny, not predatory, but intimidatory, and in a considerable number of cases it had succeeded in its purpose, and men had been induced to give up their land. Sometimes it had been because of loss of trade, sometimes from a desire not to run counter to the feeling of the people among whom they lived, sometimes from mixed motives, sometimes it was intimidation, and sometimes it was not entirely so. The fact remained that a number of persons did give up their lands in consequence either of actual cattle-drives or threats of cattle-drives. The cattle were returned. He had no doubt technically they did undergo injury. As to that, he had no evidence and he was not sufficiently acquainted with the habits of animals to say.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said he had never heard of a technical injury to cattle.

MR. BIRRELL said he meant to suggest slight injury. He was willing to admit it did not do the animals any good. But it was an element in the case that these cattle-drives were not for the purpose of gain, but for the purpose of intimidation, though he did not mean to minimise that offence in any way. All that was said on this question led up to the question at the back of the head of the right hon. Gentleman, Why did they not put the Crimes Act in force? The Government thought that on the whole they were far more likely to do the one thing in Ireland that was worth doing—to make the habits of these people law-abiding permanently— if they adhered to the ordinary law, and they were not ashamed at the same time to recognise the case for the division of these lands as soon as it could properly be accomplished. The Opposition would not hesitate themselves if in office to do what they could to purchase as many grazing lands as possible.

MR. WALTER LONG: By the aid of terrorism?

MR. BIRRELL: To avoid terrorism. If after 87 Coercion Acts right hon. Gentlemen opposite still believed in coercion, history had been written for them in vain. If the right hon. Gentleman believed that he and his friends could, by the simple expedient of sending a number of men to prison on the judgment of removable magistrates, secure that not a cow would be driven, not a sheep removed, he said their belief was vain. By the courageous exercise of the ordinary law, if they would only give them a little time, he believed they would be able to make the inhabitants of Roscommon and Galway as law-abiding citizens in the matter of the land as they were in all the other obligations of life. There were constantly under police protection fifty in June, 1907, forty-four in 1906, and thirty-three in 1905. The number of cases of protection by patrol was 157, compared with 158 in 1906, and 141 in 1905. He did not think these figures justified any strenuous argument against the present Government. He did not believe the action of the present Government had anything to do with it. He believed these things arose out of the desires and feelings and aspirations of the country-side population, and they expressed their feelings in an illegal manner against which the Government strove with all the forces of the police at their disposal. They hoped to persuade these people that in their own interest it was the greatest mistake to take this course, and they wished to do the utmost they could to punish those who engaged in these practices, and to prevent their multiplication, while pursuing the remedial measures which, after all, offered the only method of making this country-side population a law-abiding population. He wished to say a word about the Belfast matter. In the first place, in the matter of pickets, he was satisfied that the police had exercised a perfectly sound judgment. With regard to what was said by the hon. Member for Clitheroe, from his information it was a very difficult task to hold the balance evenly between different contending parties, but he could not but believe that the police had done their part exceedingly well, and he besought hon. Members to remember that the obligation of the police and of the local authority was to secure the general welfare of all parties and the general peace of the inhabitants. They could not go out of their way to consider the rights of one party or the other. Therefore he did not really think that at the present time there was any case to be made against the police. With regard to the small trouble that arose in the force, he had had some further information, and he found that the trouble was smaller even than he had expected. It was confined to about 50 men. Nobody was assaulted, and, though undoubtedly there were some small acts of insubordination, the men readily responded to the appeal that was made to them and agreed to make their written complaint to the Inspector-General. That officer was perfectly satisfied, and the men were now again in perfectly good trim and temper. He would not feel it right to withhold any advice or help he could give in a matter of this sort, but this was not a matter primarily for the Irish Government at all. They were bound, as every citizen was bound, to give assistance to the local authority if they demanded it. Having regard to the peculiar circumstances, he would always be willing to give the House any information which he received from time to time and which might properly be given. He hoped this affair would be brought to a speedy conclusion by the good sense of all concerned.

*MR. BARRIE said he felt sure the Chief Secretary had every intention to uphold the law in Ireland, but in every speech the right hon. Gentleman made he used qualifying phrases which in Ireland were interpreted into giving latitude for disregarding law and order and which made the position very difficult for people living in certain parts of the country. He had told the Committee that Ireland was peaceable. That could only be so in the light of the right hon. Gentleman's own admission if they left out of count all the reported cases in which no arrests had been made. A large portion of that regrettable result was due to the right hon. Gentleman's lack of acquaintance with the island over which he ruled where there was a prevailing opinion particularly in the disaffected centres, that the Government was not determined to enforce law and order as it should be enforced. The representatives of Ulster constituencies were aware that many sympathised with their views in isolated parts of Ireland who at present felt that they had not the security of life and property which they were entitled to receive from the Government. The duty was laid upon them to ask that there should be a closer determination on the part of the Government to see that this evil which so widely prevailed should cease. He had nothing to complain about as regarded the statement of the Chief Secretary in reference to his action in Belfast. He had acted judiciously, and he hoped the trouble would soon pass away. The matter was exceedingly difficult. He had listened with the utmost satisfaction to the guarded answers the right hon. Gentleman had given to the suggestion that there was any disloyalty on the part of that splendid body the Royal Irish Constabulary. He had known that body for many years. He had come into close association with them and had the greatest admiration for them. [Laughter.] He was not surprised that Nationalists laughed, but he was surprised the Attorney-General should see any humour in that remark.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): I was engaged in conversation with an hon. Member behind me.

*MR. BARRIE: I certainly thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman saw some humour in the remarks I was making.

MR. CHERRY: I saw nothing.

*MR. BARRIE said the matter under consideration was much too serious for any light treatment. He regretted exceedingly that they could not compliment the authorities on the state of tthe country as a whole at present. He hoped as the result of still further failures of justice in certain parts of Ireland the Government would no longer hesitate to order a change of venue to secure convictions; and thus make the law respected as it formerly was under a Unionist Government.

*MR. BYLES (Salford, N.) said he hoped to persuade the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin to withdraw his Motion for the reduction of the salary of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. He thought after the manly, frank, and vigorous speech to which they had listened none of them wanted to reduce the income of the right hon. Gentleman by £100. He would just permit himself one remark on the question of the difficulty the police were encountering. The right hon. Gentleman had drawn a picture of the difficulties to which small police barracks in Ireland were exposed, but it was equally so when the police were many. He had taken part with Members opposite in proclaimed meetings. There were big battalions of police around the place where they had announced the meeting to be held, but they went on with their meeting nevertheless, though the police were armed with batons, swords, and he knew not what. In Ireland the people were not, as in England, on the side of the police. London could be goverened by a handful of police compared with Ireland; in this country people of a village could get along with one constable, simply because the people assisted him, whereas, if they were against him the one constable would be of no use at all. He wondered that it had not been driven home in every way to hon. Members above the gangway opposite that what was wanted in Ireland was a policy of pacification, giving the Irish people power to rule themselves, a policy which the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues had encouraged by introducing at any rate an instalment of self-government in the Irish Council Bill, which, if it failed, was only because it was not strong enough. They should go on in that direction, trusting the Irish people, believing in their honesty, believing that they knew better how to rule themselves than we knew how to rule them with our miserable century of failure. It was only by such measures as they had passed in Committee yesterday, by measures of pacification and not of coercion, not by police and force, that we should be able to bring the Irish people into harmony, fellowship, loyalty, and cordial friendships with the people of this country.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said he was very sorry to join in any criticism of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He admired his literature, but he regretted his position, and he was sorry to say that since he had become Chief Secretary the right hon. Gentleman had given his sympathy entirely to hon. Members below the gangway.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Committee also report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

*MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said he desired to take the opportunity, of which he had already given notice, and which was the last opportunity of the session, to call attention to what Catholics in this country, especially the Irish Catholics and their relatives in that House, regarded as a test case in connection with the Board of Education in reference to the recognition of the Catholic school at Low Valley, near Barnsley, in Yorkshire. It raised in a definite way the whole question of the future of new Catholic schools in this country, and that was his real reason for having framed his questions in that House, in order to get, if possible, satisfactory replies from the President of the Board of Education before raising the question on the Motion for the Adjournment. This school, he considered, was unfairly struck off the grant list in September of 1905. Since then, for practically two years it had been maintained by the pence of the poor Irish Catholic miners in the district. Not a penny of State grant or of local grant had come to the school. What had been done in this instance by the Catholics was an earnest of what they would do in the future for the maintenance of their schools, in spite of rules meant to destroy denominational education; it was a proof of what the Catholics were prepared to do out of their own pockets. It was a proof of what his country people were prepared to do out of their pockets. The other day when this question was raised on the Education Estimates he gave a rough summary of the facts of the case. He merely desired now to recapitulate them briefly. They showed, to his mind, two outstanding facts. In the first place, the dilatoriness of the Board of Education had had the effect of strengthening the hands of an unfair local education authority. The application for this new school was made in January 1906. It was six months before an inspector was sent down by the Board of Education to inquire, and the Report of the inspector was made at the end of July. It was another nine months before the decision of the Board of Education was given. In other words, fifteen months were allowed to elapse. But the serious point about this was that meanwhile the local education authority had applied for and had obtained leave to get a new site to build a new school which would be too large unless the Catholic school doors were closed. At the present moment no building whatever had been erected by the local education authority, and at the very least a year probably would have to elapse before the local education authority would build a new school. It would be easy to give a *resumé* of what had happened in this matter, but he would merely refer to the words of the inspector to the Board of Education. It would be remembered that under section 9 of the Education Act of 1902 there were three points to be considered when a new school was applied for, namely, the wishes of the parents, the interests of secular education, and the economy of the rates. So far as he knew there was no reason why prominence should be given to one of these three points as against the other two. He said that by way of preface. The inspector in his Report said—

> "The desire of the parents for a Roman Catholic School was very clearly proved at the inquiry, and the evidence on this head was not contested by the local education authority. There are at present 114 children in attendance at the unrecognised Roman Catholic School, and the parents contribute according to their means in the cost of maintaining the school and paying the teachers. The schedule questions addressed to the parents of all the children at the school was signed by forty-nine parents, representing 112 children, and, in every case the answers included the statements that the parents sent their children to the school to be taught the Catholic religion, and that they would not send them to a school of any other character.
>
> "The case is therefore one in which the wishes of the parents are on the one side, and regard for the interests of secular instruction and the economy of the rates is on the other, and the decision of the Board as to the necessity of the proposed Roman Catholic School must depend on the relative value given to the three considerations mentioned in Section 9 of the Education Act, 1902. It should be said, however, that while the wishes of the parents for a Roman Catholic School were incontrovertibly demonstrated, it was not shown that recognition of the proposed school would be seriously detrimental to the interests of secular instruction, or would involve more than a slight additional charge on the rates."

The Board took nine months to act upon that Report, but meanwhile the Catholic school at Low Valley was kept going by the pence of the miners in that district, and if he knew the spirit of the Catholic people in this country, it would be kept going no matter what happened. In addition to that, the Anglican school was closed, with the result that in the neighbouring schools forty-one children were unable to find accommodation. He did not know what would happen if 120 Catholic children in the existing Catholic school in the Low Valley were turned out on to the streets. He maintained that the dilatoriness of the Board of Education had been altogether to the advantage of the local education authorities, who were allowed to build a temporary structure before the 1st of September. Under these circumstances he really failed to see how the right hon. Gentleman could say that the Board of Education stood as fair umpire between the Catholic schools and the local Education Committee in the West Riding. The Catholic people in that district had maintained their school for two years out of their own pockets, and he urged in the interests of peace and justice that these Catholic schools should be recognised, and that the wishes of the parents should be given effect to, even at the cost of a small portion of the rates. He was sure that on the point of secular instruction they would not suffer.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said he had nothing to complain of in the temperate statement of the hon. Gentleman. It was a statement of facts so far as the Catholic school was concerned, and was reasonable and accurate. But in regard to the hon. Member's reference to the action of the Board of Education, he did not think that the case was quite as sure. What had happened? The Catholic school in Low Valley was a recognised school until 1905, when by the action of the late Board it was, no doubt for good cause, struck off the grant list. It was not his doing, but was done under the authority of the late Government, as the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University would have admitted had he been in his place. In 1906 the West Riding County Council, under the Act of 1902, gave notice to build a new school, and to this no objection was taken. Now, under the provisions of a section of the Act of 1902 any person was allowed to object to any proposed new school, but in this case no objection was taken, and after the lapse of the statutory period, the county council had the right to build the school. They allowed the statutory period to elapse, and consequently at the close of that statutory period, the county council of the West Riding acquired an indefeasible right to build this school. On this point he did not think there was any difference between the hon. Member for South Kerry and himself. The West Riding County Council proceeded to acquire a site for the erection of the school. Delay had been caused by difficulties in the way of transfer, but those difficulties had been removed during the present week, so there was now no difficulty in the way of acquiring that piece of land. The County Council wanted to erect a school of a particular sort upon a particular plot of land at a considerable cost to the ratepayers, and it seemed to him that another school would be clearly unnecessary. As this particular school had not been maintained the duty was thrown upon the county council to build a school out of the rates and there was no reason to interfere with them. If it was the fact that there was insufficient accommodation for the children of the district, and the county council failed in their duty to provide accommodation, then he should consider the claim of this school for recognition. But he was informed that there was sufficient accommodation for all the children of the district, and that the county council were prepared at a moment's notice, if insufficient accommodation was shown to exist, to put up temporary buildings in order to meet the demand until they had time to build a school. All that he could say, therefore, in answer to the hon. Gentleman was that he did not see how, as the administrator of the Act of 1902, he could do otherwise than give the county council every chance to carry out their duty under the Act. If he found as a fact that there was not sufficient accommodation, and that the county council were unwilling to supply it, and that in other respects the Low Valley school was a suitable school to place on the grant list, he should have no hesitation in placing it there. If the county council had provided sufficient accommodation for the children of the district it could not be reasonably called upon to maintain out of the rates a school which, by its own action, had lost the right it had previous to September, 1905, to be recognised as an existing school.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said the Low Valley school was closed in 1905 not because there was no necessity for a Roman Catholic school, but because the buildings were insufficient and unsuitable for the accommodation of children. He did not think those responsible for the management of the school were happy in the action they took, but that was quite a different thing from there being no necessity for a Roman Catholic school. He had always recognised that given suitable buildings the Roman Catholics of the district had ample claim for a school of their own under Section 8 of the Act of 1902.

MR. MCKENNA said he thought that the hon. Gentleman would agree that it was the duty of the managers of the school to raise the objection which they never did raise.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he agreed that it would have been prudent of the managers to have raised the objection, but the Council knew perfectly well that there were 120 Roman Catholic children whose parents desired school accommodation. The Council had obtained their land, but he believed they had not yet put a brick on the site, although they knew of these circumstances. If Section 8 of the Act of 1902 was not to be a dead letter, surely the parents of the 120 children who desired school accommodation for their children should have a school of their own. Everyone knew that a multiplication of small schools was not the best thing for secular instruction; everyone knew that the addition of a school was so much more on to the rates, and before the section of the Act of 1902 was put into operation the education authority ought to weigh what were the wishes of the parents, to consider how many children were concerned, and how earnest the parents were in desiring the special accommodation. There could be no doubt that 120 children was a number which justified their having a school of their own. There could be no doubt that the parents in this case had shown by their action that they were fully in earnest in desiring that there should be this school; and though this belated authority were to provide a school which could not be said to be wanted by Roman Catholic children, which might be wanted possibly on a smaller scale by the children of other denominations, and which had not yet been built, such a circumstance ought not to stand in the way of any legitimate desire of the Roman Catholic population in the area. He ventured to think that the right hon. Gentleman was not justified in not putting into operation Section 8 of the Act of 1902 on behalf of the Roman Catholic population.

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth N.) said the question was whether the right hon. Gentleman was lending himself to a local device of an oppressive and an anti-religious character. In his judgment the right hon. Gentleman was. The Liberal Party ought to make up their minds on this question, whether they were going to give the Catholics fair play or not, because if they thought that, by dangling before them political advantages of any kind or sort or description, they would be diverted from their object, he told them that the device would wholly fail, for, as against any political advantage which the Liberal Party might offer, they would stick to their schools and to their religion. If this were a case of 120 Jews in the City of London the right hon. Gentleman would not dare to do what he had done, and if there were a cry as to oppression of the Jews, how long would he hold his position? When the responsible body obeyed the law and put the school buildings in proper order, and therefore were once more entitled to receive the grant, what were they to think of the central authority which connived at a most bigoted and oppressive kind of action? He was bound to say that the authority concerned was, he believed, the only body in broad Britain who, because of a failure on the part of the Catholic managers, would pretend that it was going to build a school, and a Liberal Government for nearly two years had connived at its want of action; so that to-day, while there was not one brick resting on the top of another, the Catholics who had put themselves in full efficiency and in full title so far as their buildings were concerned for the grant, were told by a Liberal Government "No; we will give you no grant, because the West Riding body are going to erect a building which will be capacious enough to hold all the Catholics of the district."

And it being half-past Eleven of the clock Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at half after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 26*th July*, 1907.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent—

1. Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment.
2. Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1).
3. Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2).
4. Local Government Ireland Provisional Orders (No. 2).
5. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1).
6. Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2).
7. Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 4).
8. Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5).
9. Ladybank Sewerage, Drainage, and Water Provisional Order.
10. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, &c.)
11. Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2).
12. Clyde Navigation Order Confirmation.
13. Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation.
14. Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1).
15. Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation.
16. Southend Water.
17. Burnham (Somerset) Pier.
18. Hull and Barnsley Railway.
19. Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board.
20. Brighouse Corporation.
21. King Edward's Hospital Fund for London.
22. Heywood and Middleton Water Board.
23. London United Tramways.
24. Pontypridd Urban District Council.
25. Wisbech Water.
26. United Methodist Church.
27. Great Northern and City Railway.
28. Rawtenstall Corporation.
29. Great Central Railway.
30. Devonport Corporation.
31. Tees Valley Water (Consolidation).
32. Leeds Corporation.
33. Kendal Corporation.
34. Central London Railway.
35. Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas.
36. Bude Gas.
37. King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council.
38. London and North-Western Railway.
39. Penrith Urban District Council.
40. Worthing Gas.
41. Alton Military Hospital.
42. Electric Supply Corporation.
43. FitzGerald's Divorce.
44. Killery's Divorce.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Twelve o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 26*th July*, 1907.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

High Court of Justice, King's Bench Division (Additional Judge). The Comptroller of the Household reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address as followeth :—

"I have received your Address praying that, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, an additional Judge may be appointed to the High Court of Justice in the King's Bench Division thereof, and I will issue directions in accordance with your desire."

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills. (See p. 237.)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill; Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [Lords]; Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

CONVENT LAUNDRIES.

Petition from Edinburgh, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Forfar, against; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Orkney, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Walkerburn, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MONASTIC AND CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Two Petitions from Reading, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL.

Petition from Hertfordshire, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Brixton and other places, and Shepherd's Bush and other places; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (NEW CHARTERS).

Copy presented, of Charter of Incorporation of the Borough of Nuneaton, dated the 22nd July, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FORESHORES (SALES, ETC.)

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 25th July; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 269.]

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th July; *Sir Frederick Banbury*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 270.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3872 to 3875 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (BOMBAY POLITICAL DEPARTMENT).

Address for "Return showing the length of service and present pay and allowance of all Officers in the Bombay Political Department, showing the pay and allowances of the military Officers of the Department as compared with the pay and allowances of military Officers of the same length of service in the general cadre of the Indian Political Department, and as compared with the pay and allowances of Officers of the same length of service serving with their regiments."—(*Sir Seymour King.*)

KING'S BENCH JUDGES.

Address for "Return showing, for the years 1905 and 1906, in the case of each Judge of the King's Bench Division, the number of days on which he was absent from the King's Bench Division to go on circuit and the number of days on which he sat at assizes for the trial of prisoners or of civil cases."—(*Mr. Herbert Craig.*)

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) [REMUNERATION].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of the remuneration of any interim Sheriff Substitute appointed in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to regulate and amend the Laws and practice relating to the civil procedure in Sheriff Courts in Scotland (King's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Completion of new Destroyers.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty the average time taken to complete the six destroyers of the 1905-6 programme, reckoning the time from the date of the announcement of the programme to Parliament in February, 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) None of the six destroyers referred to have yet been completed, and it is therefore not possible to supply the information desired.

Irish Post Office Clerks and Alleged Favouritism.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the resolutions passed at the annual conference of the Irish Post Office clerks with regard to favouritism and secret reporting, and as to the manner in which disciplinary inquiries are conducted; and what action, if any, he proposes to take in these matters.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Resolutions dealing with the subjects referred to by the hon. Member were passed at the annual conference of Irish Post Office clerks on the 5th instant. Evidence on those subjects was given before the Select Committee of this House which is now about to Report.

The Australian Commonwealth and the Companies (Colonial Registers) Act.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will explain the ground on which it is thought necessary to remove doubt as to the Commonwealth of Australia being included in the British Colonies covered by The Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883, and not thought necessary to deal in the same way with the Dominion of Canada.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The doubt raised by the Commonwealth of Australia was due to the special form of constitution conferred upon that country by the Act of 1900. In view of the fact that the federal constitution of Canada differs from that of Australia, and of the fact that Canada has not raised any doubt or asked for any amendment of the law, that country was not included in the Bill to amend the Companies Acts now before Parliament, and before any amendment of the Bill in this respect could be adopted the Government of Canada would have to be consulted.

Silver Coinage.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer how many descriptions of silver coins are still issued by Great Britain, the United States, Germany, and France, respectively; and whether there is any evidence to show that the number of British issues might be diminished with advantage.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) New issues of silver coin in the United Kingdom are now ordinarily made only in the five denominations: half-crown, florin, shilling, sixpence, threepence. The current new issues in the United States are at present confined to three denominations (silver dollars not having been struck since 1905); in Germany to four; and in France to three. Of our own issues, that of threepences is comparatively small in amount, and during the last twenty years the popularity of the florin has steadily increased at the expense of the half-crown; but I am not prepared to say that there is any positive evidence that the number of denominations might be diminished with advantage.

Revenue from Taxes on Food, Drink, and Tobacco.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the total revenue derived in the last financial year from taxes on food, drink, and tobacco, and licenses for the manufacture or sale of these articles.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) £64,839,260.

Civil Rights of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he proposes to take any steps to cause the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland to comply with the public demands made in Ireland, and endorsed by himself, dealing with the civil rights of teachers; and, if so, at what time he proposes to do so.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I regret that I can add nothing to the very full reply which I gave to the hon. Member's Question on this subject on 13th May last.†

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be considered upon Wednesday next.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Shackleton; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Parker.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee C: Mr. Murphy.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George Hardy and Mr. Hedges; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Nicholls and Mr. Bennett.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (added in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. Beck; and had reinstated on the Committee (previously discharged in respect of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill): Mr. George White.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Mr. Arkwright; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Sir Francis Powell.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

UNITED METHODIST CHURCH BILL [LORDS].

Ordered, that the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee be printed. [No. 271.]

PUBLICATIONS.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 272.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs), in moving, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed; that, at the conclusion of Government business each day, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11," said—I have to make this Motion, which is the usual one as the close of the session approaches, and to offer such excuses as I can for the length and prolongation of the session to the late time of the year to which it is necessary to ask the House to sit. The truth is, a large portion of our time was occupied, and fruitfully occupied, at the early period of the session, first, by discussions upon rules of procedure, upon which opinions will differ, and are bound to differ, but which embodied a well-considered design for increasing the efficiency of the House in its legislative capacity. These discussions occupied, as the House will remember, a number of Government days at a time when the Government has but a small share of the public time allotted to it. The same remarks apply to the proposals of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War for regulating the military service of the country. That Bill, I think, took up thirteen days of the time of the House, which, again I would remind the House, at that period of the session made a large inroad on the time usually allotted to us. Therefore, we are obliged to ask the House to sit well into August—beyond the middle of August. This is not a pleasant duty for one who has always advocated an early rising of the House, but there are circumstances, and I have mentioned some of them, which are more powerful than our own inclinations and desire; therefore I will make a general statement as to the amount of legislative work we shall have to call on the House to undertake during these last weeks of the session. First of all I will name the Bills we think should not be proceeded with. The Naval Lands Bill must suffer that fate; the Statute Law Revision Bill is a large measure which we cannot hope to proceed with; the Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, which is opposed in certain quarters; the Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, which, however much it may be required, must be abandoned.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 581.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): It is only a Bill for taking money from Ireland.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I leave the observation to be adjusted as may be thought fit. There is the Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Bill, to which there is strong opposition; the Municipal Milk Depots Bill again meets with strong opposition; the Telegraphs Construction Bill can wait; and the Companies Consolidation Bill is a large measure for which clearly the House has not time. These are Bills that must be parted with. The next list is a list of Bills which are of a non-Party and non-controversial kind, and of a Departmental character, which we hope to be able to pass. But they are Bills which it will be impossible to proceed with if they are keenly opposed by any considerable section of Members of the House. They are important and useful Bills, but unless they are agreed Bills we cannot attempt to carry them. The first of these is the Companies Bill, which has passed through the other House, and which, I believe, is strongly demanded in the public interest. I trust that any outstanding points of controversy in it may be adjusted; unless that is so we cannot hope to pass it into law. The Employers' Liability (Insurance Companies) Bill, to protect the public from insurance companies of a mushroom kind in respect of workmen's compensation, we should be glad to pass if it can be arranged. The Factory and Workshop Bill, to amend the law relating to the inspection of laundries, is of the same character; and so also is the Cab Fares Bill, to enable the Home Secretary to fix a limit for cab fares in London. There are next the Prisons (Ireland) Bill, to assimilate the law in Ireland to the English law in certain respects, and the Education (Scotland) Bill. Scotland has had an Education Bill dangled before it for the last few years, but from one cause or another it has always been disappointed. This is a Bill that is ardently desired in almost all its particulars, but there are one or two points in it upon which opposition will be offered, and therefore I put it in this category. If, as I hope, we can come to one mind on the subject, we shall be greatly pleased if it can be passed into law. The Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Bill is a Bill of the same sort; and also the Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill. The Vaccination (Scotland) Bill assimilates the law as to vaccinaion in Scotland to the law in England, and I hope that will be agreed to. The Public Health (Scotland)

Bill is a Departmental Bill; and there is a Bill dealing with salmon and fresh-water fisheries. These comprise the category of Bills which can be passed, and we hope may be passed, if they are admitted to be more or less agreed Bills. I now come to the Bills with which we are resolved to proceed. I need not mention the Appropriation Bill; and there is, of course, the Army Bill, which will return to us from another place in a day or two. There are the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, which is nearly through Committee; the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, of which we mean to take the Report on Monday; the Small Landowners (Scotland) Bill, which we hope will be through Committee next week, where it has been very largely criticised and examined; the Land Values (Scotland) Bill, which is awaiting its Committee stage; and the Patents and Designs Bill, which is awaiting Report, and to which I hope there will not be much objection. Then there are two agreed Bills—the Patents and Designs (Consolidation) Bill and the Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Bill. There are also the Butter and Margarine Bill, the Report of which we shall take to-day; the Criminal Appeal Bill, which passed the House of Lords last year and which I know has strong support there. We hope to finish the Report stage on Monday, and I hope this Bill will not be very keenly opposed. The Matrimonial Causes Bill is an agreed measure; and the Australian States Constitution Bill and the Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill are also, of course, agreed Bills. The Employment of Women Bill, to carry out certain international agreements, is also an agreed Bill. The Probation of Offenders Bill is, I think, generally welcomed in this House, and it is awaiting Report. The Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill embodies the non-contentious portions of the Education Bill of last year, and I hope it is agreed to. I think there is also general agreement upon the Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill. The Judicature (Ireland) Bill was introduced by the late Government to reduce the number of Judges in Ireland, and I hope it may be passed. The Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill is a small Bill which will be useful to the fishing industry. The Irish Land (No. 2) Bill affects mineral rights. Then there are two Bills, one for England and one for Scotland, dealing with the qualification of women for sitting on local authorities. The English Bill is still before the Committee of the other House, but it will, I hope, be sent down here very shortly. The Vaccination Bill, which awaits the Report stage; the Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, for the protection of the public health from what is called prepared food, as to which there is much need for protection; the Telegraphs (Money) Bill, which is awaiting Third Reading; the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill, which has passed its Second Reading and is awaiting Committee. Of these, I am entitled to say that there are only three which seem to be seriously opposed. I exclude the English Small Holdings and Allotment Bill for the reason that it was passed unanimously in both the principal stages, and although there may be controversy as to details, the main object and purpose of the Bill appears not to be contentious or controversial. The Evicted Tenants Bill and apparently the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, and the Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill appear to be of the contentious kind. I think that is a very modest proportion of absolutely controversial measures. That is the programme I have to put before the House. There is one Bill which I seem to have omitted. That is the Bill which my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India introduced yesterday dealing with the Council of India. Of course, at this time of the session that Bill can hardly be proceeded with if there is much opposition to it, but although it is important, it is a very short and concise Bill. There will also be the Transvaal Loan Bill, which will be introduced very shortly.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover-square): The Pacific Islands Bill?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That question is still before the law officers on the point, as I understand, whether it is necessary to have a Bill at all. I do not think a decision has yet been arrived at. These are the measures which we hope to pass with the good-will of the House. We cannot ask for much good-will as to the contentious Bills, except the ordinary courtesy that we have always received from the Opposition in all parts of the House, but I think we may expect the active and energetic good-will of the House in regard to the category of measures to which I have referred which merely require the adjustment of some difficulties they contain in order that they may become agreed Bills. With that good-will, after having looked carefully into it, we think it possible that Parliament should be prorogued on 24th August. But I need hardly point out that, without saying that is a sanguine view, it is a view which can only be brought to fruition if the House addresses itself, as I have no doubt it will, to the future work of legislation with a desire to occupy as little time as is consistent with the proper consideration of the measures before it. I do not think I have anything to add, Sir, and I hope the House will not think we have made a too exorbitant demand upon its patience. I beg to move the Resolution standing in my name.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed; that, at the conclusion of Government Business each day, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): The right hon. Gentleman has addressed himself to his task, which is never a very agreeable one for the Leader of the House, with great good humour and in a spirit of the most sanguine hope—always a useful and sometimes a necessary preparation for dealing with the practical affairs of life. I should have thought, if he had made this speech in February last, that he was asking us to find more time than it was likely the House would provide in order to get through the programme which he has cheerfully sketched out on 26th July. I really think he has forgotten the occasion of his speech, and that he has made a mistake of about six months in its application. Although I am ready, not perhaps willingly, to sit as long as the right hon. Gentleman requires me to do so, I confess when I remember that last year there were only two months—January and September—in which this House was not sitting, and in this year there has been only one month—namely, January—in which the House has not sat, I am bound to say that I think the right hon. Gentleman is throwing a heavy burden on those who think it their duty to deal to the best of their ability with the schemes the Government brings forward. Now what does the right hon. Gentleman propose? I have not put down all the Bills he mentioned, but my right hon. friend near me tells me he enumerated forty-three Bills which he hopes to pass. [Cheers.] I daresay it is very desirable to pass them. I am not dealing with the merits of the Bills, I am dealing with the number, and it will hardly be denied by hon. Gentlemen who cheered that enumeration that, on July 26th, the prospect of having to deal with forty-three more Bills is not exhilarating to those who, like the right hon. Gentleman, desire to spend their time in July, or, at all events, in August, September, and October, in a more cheerful atmosphere than they can expect this House to provide. The right hon. Gentleman is no doubt justified in saying that of these forty-three Bills there are a certain number which everybody desires to see passed, and which will provoke very little discussion; but with regard to a large number even of those which he rightly describes as being non-Party Bills, he must expect that, unless the House is to be exhausted by late hours and long sittings, there will be a legitimate desire on the part of Members on both sides of the House to offer some criticism and comment. I suppose he means to pass these Bills at three or four o'clock in the morning, when no doubt, the ardour of criticism greatly diminishes, unless there is to be one of those fights which none of us like, but which from time to time on both sides of the House it appears necessary to indulge in. When the right hon. Gentleman came to the category of Bills which may properly be called contentious, and which he admits to be contentious, I was surprised to find him omitting the English Land Bill. It is quite true that the object of that Bill commends itself to Members on both sides of the House, and that no division was taken on the Second Reading; but I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not assume that that Bill either can or ought to leave this House without receiving a full measure of comment and criticism in the whole House. It deals not only with a great object, but with great interests—the interests of local authorities, the interests of those who desire land, the interests of those who possess land, and the interests of those who cultivate the land—all interests that require and demand from this House fair discussion and fair comment. If you add, therefore, the English Land Bill to the Bills which the right hon. Gentleman admits to be contentious, the Scottish Small Holders Bill, the Scottish Valuation Bill, and the remaining stages of the Evicted Tenants Bill, I think the right hon. Gentleman will feel that the idea of our getting up on 24th August is really quite ludicrous, unless he takes such steps as I will refer to directly, and even, I think, after he does take those steps. The English Land Bill, I understand, cannot be down here for discussion on the Report Stage until the week after next, and I believe the same is the case with the Scottish Small Holders Bill; therefore it cannot be before 5th August that, for the first time, this House, as a whole, will be permitted to deal with these two great measures. And as for the Scottish Valuation Bill, a Bill which may have every merit in the world, but it is undoubtedly revolutionary in the magnitude of its scope, and which, from the nature of the case, demands an opportunity for discussion, seeing that it involves a principle which, if accepted for Scotland, cannot be confined to Scotland—that Bill has not even gone upstairs for discussion in Committee, still less has it had effective discussion in the House. I suppose the Scottish Valuation Bill cannot go to the Scottish Grand Committee until that Committee has finished dealing with the Scottish Small Holders Bill; that is to say, it cannot begin to discuss that Bill until the week after next. This immense revolutionary change in the whole system on which it is proposed to value rateable property will not be discussed, even upstairs, and still less in this House, until 7th August. And yet the right hon. Gentleman expects to get up by 24th August! Is that really his sanguine hope? Can he really expect to get up even by 1st October? [Cries of "September."] Well, I am not sure it will not be 1st October. Whether we like it or not, we are to sit here, patiently or impatiently, up to some unknown date in the month or months succeeding August. I have forgotten to mention the Transvaal Loan Bill. The right hon. Gentleman must be perfectly well aware that that Bill, in the opinion of hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, is a Bill which raises most formidable issues in connection with our policy in the Transvaal. It raises most formidable issues in connection with the general position of British finance. It is a Bill with a double aspect, each aspect requiring and demanding that full discussion in this House which I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give us an opportunity of having. I do not ask that he should put every stage of that Bill down at a convenient time, but I am sure it would be an absolute outrage on such liberties as are still left to us if we have not a full and fair opportunity of discussing the character of that Bill—the ground which has induced the Government to adopt the Bill, the views which the Transvaal population hold with regard to it, its effect on the credit of the Transvaal, how the credit of the Transvaal affects the security of the loans we have already made to that country, and the effect upon our money market. It is not a long measure, but it raises points of enormous importance, and it has to be squeezed in after next week between all these Scottish and English Land Bills and Valuation Bills, and all the rest of the controversial measures. Then they all have to go to the Lords, and will probably be amended by the Lords, and have to be rediscussed here. How the right hon. Gentleman can without a smile on his face and with the impressive gravity of the practised prophet come down and talk about 24th August I really cannot imagine. I do not think it would be in accordance with usage or precedent, and I do not think it would be expedient on the present occasion, to allow this Motion to pass without some comment on the past as well as a forecast of the future. The right hon. Gentleman has not, I think, shown himself very successful in his forecast of the future, and he has been wisely reticent as to what has gone on in the past. But I think if he will cast his eye back over the session he will feel probably that the responsibility for the want of progress is certainly in no small degree owing to the methods he has adopted, and the Motions he has brought before us. We have really expended time on other matters than legislation which make this huge legislative programme, be its merits what you like, absolutely out of place. When I go back to the King's Speech at the beginning of the session, I remember various incidents which I am sure will give some disquiet to the right hon. Gentleman if he makes the same survey as I do. He promised us a great measure about the House of Lords. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] He promised to deal with the House of Lords. How has he dealt with it? He brought forward an abstract Resolution which took a whole week of our Parliamentary time—three complete days which could have been given to legislation—and which, as far as I can see, from the right hon. Gentleman's point of view, has not advanced matters at all. Let us grant for the sake of argument that the House of Lords requires all the coercive measures the right hon. Gentleman desires to apply to it, how is that object furthered by an abstract Resolution which wastes the most valuable period of the session in perfectly barren controversies which do not help matters so far as the Government are concerned, which compel us to give up our rights of free debate and to sit in months when we would much rather be doing something else, and give whatever excuse there may be for that persistent interference with liberty of discussion which is becoming more and more a fatal habit with the right hon. Gentleman? I remember when the King's Speech was under discussion, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Westmoreland got up and said he was delighted with the intentions of the Government on temperance reform. He was good enough to say I had twitted the Government with a passion for constitutional changes which were thrusting into a remote and indefinite future the projects of social reform about which people talked so much in the country. The hon. Gentleman, with less experience, perhaps, than some other Members of the House, took the amiable observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House on the subject of temperance reform as a proof that my criticism of his words was an unfounded criticism, and that the Government for once really did mean business. How soon were the sanguine hopes of the hon. Gentleman dashed to the ground! Not only have the Government not found time for that particular instalment of social reform, but they have admitted that they were never in a position, even had they had the time, to bring forward a measure. They have been talking about temperance. not merely since they came into office, but for months, for years —well, for a Parliamentary generation; and yet they not only could not find time for a measure, but they have not got a measure even if they could find the time. The hon. Gentleman will do well on the occasion of the next King's Speech to moderate the sanguineness of his expectations. He is not the only gentleman, nor does he belong to the only Party, who cherished, and thought they had a right to cherish, the strongest views as to the amount of time the Government were going to devote to carrying out their particular desires. I remember the Leader of the Irish Party got up on the King's Speech and told the House there was a distinct understanding that there was to be an Irish session; and that the Government were pledged to carry great reforms for Ireland leading on to the full policy of Home Rule. I have not quoted the exact words which were used, but that is practically their substance. We know what has happened to these expectations; we do not know what would have happened if the hon. Gentleman and his friends had not summarily put down their foot upon the abortive legislative efforts of the Secretary for Ireland. Why, we should be now discussing, not only the English and the Scottish Land Bills, the subject of the Irish evicted tenants, Transvaal loans, and the other thirty-six measures we have to deal with, but we should be involved in the Serbonian bog of Irish *quasi*-Home Rule legislation. Whatever disappointment the Leader of the Irish Party may feel on this question, and however painful may be the disappointment of the parental hopes of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, if either of these two Gentlemen has the smallest affection for a holiday, he must rejoice at the unhappy blight, the untimely frost, which earlier in the session destroyed this budding legislation. The time the right hon. Gentleman has spent upon the new Rules of the House is time which has been equally misspent with that bestowed on the abstract discussion about the House of Lords. I do not wish too early to prophesy as to what the fate of this new scheme of sending up the biggest measures to Grand Committee may be, but I think nobody can watch the working of that system without feeling the deepest disquiet as to its effect upon the general deliberations of this House. It has been shown to throw quite undue labours on these new Members of the House in the Grand Committee. Any number of Gentlemen in this House can testify how heavy and intolerable is this burden of anxiously dealing with the details of a Bill from eleven o'clock in the morning till four in the afternoon, and then attending the sittings of this House. I cannot help thinking the emptiness of our benches during important debates is, in part at least, due to this cause. There is yet a more important point than the labour thrown upon individual Members. This session shows a really alarming advance in the methods by which the Administration of the day are dealing with free speech. It was after we had been in Committee a good deal over thirty days on the Education Bill of 1902, when the House had been sitting nine or ten months, that, as Leader of the House, I moved closure by compartments on that measure. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer got up and said —no doubt with truth—that these were great invasions upon the liberty of debate, and that what was done by the Government would, of course, be done by their successors. But the present Government has gone on to what is far worse. The glory of this House used to be that in Committee or on Report it was able to deal with the details of a Bill. Now you send your important Bills to Committee upstairs; upstairs you closure them; they come downstairs, and, instead of giving the House on Report some pale reflection, at all events, of the powers it had on the Committee stage, you immediately proceed to gag the Report stage by compartments. The result is that this House has really no power of discussing the details of the Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman was correct in 1902, when he said that what the then Government did threw an excess of power into the hands of the Executive, and made them, not merely arbiters of the policy of the country, but uncontrolled arbiters of the legislation of the country, what must he think of his own colleagues who have carried that process to a degree never before dreamed of? Every thinking man will have the gravest doubts as to whether, unless we find some wholly new solution of our difficulties this House can be in the future anything like what it has been—the glory of our institutions. I remember the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Rushcliffe once saying that the amount of closure put on by any Government was the measure of their incompetence. If that be a true canon of criticism, how unplumbed must be the depths of incompetence of those who at present control the destinies of the House! No past Government has approached the present holders of office in the manner in which they have dealt with our debates. It is evident from what fell from the Prime Minister that he looks forward cheerfully to increasing the stringency of methods which most people, I believe, think sufficiently stringent already. Whatever he does, I do not think he will be able to get away by 24th August; but that he should dream of it clearly indicates that he is not going to allow the House to discuss on the Report stage either the Scottish Landholders Bill, the Scottish Valuation Bill, or the English Bill, or the Transvaal Loan Bill. In the calculations he and his friends have made they must have openly admitted to each other that if this programme was possible at all, it was only possible at the price of preventing this House discussing fully any single one of these measures. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."] I think that is a deplorable practice. It must be borne in mind that the Government of the day is sometimes beaten in Grand Committee. In such a case, when the Bill comes back to this House, shall we have an opportunity of discussing the views of the Grand Committee if the Government desire to restore the measure to its original state? Not at all. These Amendments introduced in Grand Committee will be dealt with mechanically at half-past ten some evening in the middle of August, and even the very members of the Grand Committee who defeated the Government will, I dare say, march into the lobby to support them in this silent and uncriticised reversal of the policy adopted upstairs. I think that is a very unhappy state of things and deserves the most earnest attention of the Government. I quite recognise the difficulty which any Government has in dealing with this matter, but this Government has been absolutely reckless in regard to the amount of legislation. They have so trusted to the machinery of the closure that they do not think it worth while to think over Bills before introducing them, conscious that their worst blunders can be put right in another place. I see no signs whatever that the right hon. Gentleman has learned in this respect by experience. May I remind him of the solemn pledge which he has already given, as I understand, for next session? He is then going to deal with the licensing question, and to deal in an avowedly controversial spirit with education, and I believe we are to have a great Budget. The sugar duties and the old-age pension scheme will come up in a more serious fashion than they have done in the present session. Then there are the questions of English land valuation, Irish University education, Welsh Disestablishment, and the abolition of the House of Lords. That is not what is commonly called a modest programme. Even that programme includes nothing for Ireland. I do not know whether we are to have a Home Rule Bill in addition. I do not know if he is going to try his 'prentice hand on another instalment of Home Rule. If not, I do not know what hon. Gentlemen below the gangway will say; but, if he does, I think that by this time next year, when the right hon. Gentleman comes down to slaughter the innocents, he will probably find himself immersed in the details of the measure. I think each one of the Bills I have mentioned has been promised priority in turn.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): We have been promised first place for the Licensing Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I would, in all good feeling, advise the hon. Member not to be too sanguine that in the legislative programme next year his cherished project will find first place. Whether he will like it when he sees it is another question. Is it not a serious thing for those who care for the interests of the House that the Government have been forced by the programme of this year and their management of it into these intolerable measures of closure by compartments? Is it not a serious thing that they are going to try a programme next year which I do not think can be carried through, even with a double measure of severity? I think it is the duty of every man who cares for this House—and I have spent too much of my life in it not to care for it with an almost passionate interest—it is our bounden duty to see if there cannot be found some solution for the difficulties which press upon us. I have no hope that we shall ever be able to go back to the halcyon days of twenty or thirty years ago. I quite agree that there will always be, and must be, limitations upon our debates, which we have to regret, but the limitations are reaching a point which makes free discussion an absolute impossibility. Nobody will deny that measures are leaving this House more and more undebated, undiscussed, undealt with, and with a majority of Members knowing but little more than the general scope of the Bill and the general machinery for carrying it out. Nobody can deny that, if there is to be discussion and examination, we are more and more being driven to rely on the work of the other House, which is here the object of so much unjust criticism. Whatever we may think of the House of Lords, whether it is good or bad, I am too proud of being a Member of the House of Commons to wish to see the House of Lords surpass it in its great function as a deliberative Assembly. I do most earnestly hope that the Prime Minister will do two things—that he will, in the first place, try to moderate the magnitude of the programme he is henceforth going to ask the House to get through in the course of a session, and that he will, in the second place, set his mind to the far more difficult and important problem of how even a moderately modest programme is to be got through without unduly curtailing the immemorial rights of this House.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said this was an annual demonstration, to which old Members were well accustomed. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the admirable good humour with which he had performed his part. He was not going to follow the right hon. Gentleman into his imaginative forecast of what lay before them in the immediate future, except to enter a *caveat* against the assumption that the list of Bills which he read out represented the measures which the Government had pledged themselves to introduce in the next session of Parliament. Nor was he going to discuss whether the Prime Minister and his colleagues had been too optimistic as regards the future. The sole point for which he rose was to deal with what the right hon. Gentleman had said by way of criticism of the Government in their management of the business of the session. He entirely dissented from the view that the three days occupied in debating the question of the House of Lords was time wasted. On the contrary, he thought they had advanced a step, and a very long step, in the practical dealing with this most urgent question. For, in the first place, the House, by an enormous majority, affirmed its view of the relative position of the two Chambers in the Constitution, and further there was a general and almost complete acquiescence on the Ministerial side in the main principles of the practical scheme for dealing with the matter which the Prime Minister adumbrated.

A much more vulnerable point for the right hon. Gentleman's attack would have been if he had asked them what possible justification they had for devoting a whole day of Parliamentary time to the discussion of Colonial preference—a question which was decided at the General Election. That, of course, was in deference to constitutional Parliamentary tradition, which compelled the Government to place a day at the disposal of the Leaders of the Opposition for a vote of censure. The plan for extending the reference of Bills to Committees upstairs, which the right hon. Gentleman thought was a retrogade step, was put forward as an experiment, and, as far as he was able to form an opinion, it was an experiment which was absolutely necessary if this House was to perform even a tithe of the business of the country. The right. hon. Gentleman had bemoaned the sad fate of Members of the Opposition in having to attend all the morning at those Committees, and all the evening in the House. Looking at the right hon. Member for South Dublin and the hon. baronet the Member for the City of London, he did not think there were any two Members in the House who bore less sign of wear and tear, or more capacity for continuous and strenuous labour. As long as they had men sent here by the constituencies endowed with their physical and intellectual powers, there need be no fear of a breakdown of the Parliamentary machine. The Scottish Land Bill had been in the Grand Committee ten hours a week throughout the whole of May, June and July, and that it should require an inordinate amount of Parliamentary time when it came back to the House on Report was perfectly preposterous. As regarded the English Bill, it had had happier treatment, a great deal of time had been most fruitfully occupied in the discussion of details, which could be handled in a much more practical spirit in the Committee than in the House, and there again the claim that they should spend a large amount of time in doing the work over again was not in accordance with the real requirements of the case or the best Parliamentary tradition.

There was nobody on either side who regarded the guillotine, and the manner in which it had been applied, with anything like unqualified satisfaction. The right hon. Gentleman had truly said that he did not apply the guillotine to the Education Bill in 1902 until after the measure had been for some time in Committee. He himself, however, pointed out then, and subsequent experience had shown, that if they once began the use of an instrument like the guillotine it would be used with increasing vigour and severity year by year. The right hon. Gentleman had wisely confined his references to the Bill of 1902, but his own recollection was that only a few lines of the Aliens Bill were discussed before the closure was applied. [An HON. MEMBER: After three days.] And what about the Licensing Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Eleven days.

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, and then it was compulsorily closured. These cases, when they came to be examined, showed that anything which this Government had done would bear not unfavourable comparison with the action of their predecessors. However, he was not anxious to engage in a game of battledore and shuttlecock, or reciprocal recrimination. He quite agreed that the state of things was unsatisfactory. One of the most urgent needs in their procedure was the devising of some machinery by which wholesale closure would be taken out of the hands of the Government and the majority of the day, and by which there would be something like a regulation, by some more or less impartial tribunal, of the amount of time to be given to different subjects. In the absence of that machinery, they must go on in the present rough-and-ready and unsatisfactory way unless the House of Commons and its work were to be reduced to impotence and become a laughing-stock both to itself and the nation.

He wished to make one remark in regard to the Transvaal Loan which had been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman. Under the procedure of this House they had first of all a Resolution in Committee previous to the introduction of a Bill involving public expenditure, then Report on the Resolution; then Committee on the Bill, and Report. As regarded the rules and machinery of the House, ample opportunity was afforded for discussion; and he could not see any necessity for the extension of those proceedings into minute Committee details. He submitted to the House that they had made a not improvident and not wasteful use of the opportunities the House had placed at their disposal, and that their legislative programme would redeem this session from the charge of legislative barrenness.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that in the few words he wished to address to the House he had no desire to continue what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had called the annual demonstration towards the end of the session. No Radical could believe that the present position of things in the House was satisfactory. It was, he believed, by devolution alone that the House could be relieved of this yearly wrangle and of the constant increase of pressure on Members not to express their opinion on the matters that came before them. But apart from devolution those who were anxious for progress could not be satisfied with the present condition of affairs. He condemned the manner in which the new Army scheme had been placed before the House so as to consume thirteen days, during which the new Members had to vote in troops and legions for a Bill which they did not profess to understand and which competent men declared to be, except for one or two clauses, unnecessary, because the changes could have been accomplished without coming to the House. If the House was slow in adopting devolution, if there was not to be an autumn session, it was evident that they would have to employ the guillotine more and more every year. It would not be in order to discuss in detail any of the Bills which the Government had resolved to pass. The Prime Minister had said it was his intention to pass a Scottish Valuation Bill upon grounds which, if sound, would apply with tenfold force to the English Bill; but he did not think they were sound. He thought, however, that the changes foreshadowed in the Bill in regard to valuation were not greater than those made by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite in regard to agricultural rates without a special Valuation Bill. They had to ask now whether they were being called upon to support the right Bills. Labour legislation was beginning to fall into arrear. Not one of the eighteen Bills already prepared had been brought forward. He appealed to hon. Members to turn their minds to devolution and the necessity for sitting for a greater portion of the year. As to the time alleged to be required for drafting measures, he reminded the House that in 1870 the Irish Land Bill, drafted entirely by Mr. Gladstone himself, the Education Bill and the Ballot Bill, all first-class measures, were drafted under circumstances at least as difficult as those of the present year. The Ballot Bill did not pass that year because of the action of the House of Lords, though it passed the following year. In fact, Ministers who were the most hard worked in the House found time to draft their Bills. They were now face to face with the English Land Bill, which was only drafted during the present session.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he intervened in the debate chiefly to put one or two questions in regard to the details of the business of the Government. It would ill become new Members when the House was in controversy as to its proceedings to express too dogmatically their views upon Standing Orders and Procedure. For, he confessed that the more they considered the rules of debate in the House, the more difficult it was to understand them. He wished to emphasise that the Labour Members came to the House full of a desire to do honour to its traditions, and they associated themselves with the tribute paid to the House of Commons by the right hon. Member for the City of London. They came there to do work, and they believed the House would allow them to do this work. But there was no good in trying to disguise that they had been disillusioned; for somehow or other the House of Commons did not do work and did not allow others who wanted work to be done to carry out their intentions. Some of them had been carefully studying the evidence given upstairs by some older Members who were entitled to speak on its machinery; and he was struck in listening to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition with its omissions of points he had brought out in his evidence. Would it not be well that some of the more authoritative Members should say on the floor of the House what they had said before this Committee? The right hon. Gentleman had said in his evidence that measures which might be considered non-controversial became controversial if discussing them was likely to embarrass the Government. Would not the honest recognition of that truth on the floor of the House by those who had influence over private Members assist the House in getting out of their difficulties? It was no good talking about the guillotine limiting the right of private Members to express their opinions. That right must be limited if it was abused. However much they might object to it—and personally he objected to it very much—what was the use of trying to hide it from themselves like an ostrich hiding its head in the sand? The remedy rested not upon the guillotine, or Resolutions, or Standing Orders, but on the individual Members themselves. If hon. Members cared to do certain things no Standing Order could prevent them. No Standing Order that could be devised could prevent certain hon. Members from abusing the privileges of debate in the House. He spoke with a good deal of feeling on this matter, because he felt deeply. Here they were practically at the end of the session with a most formidable list of measures which they wanted to discuss reasonably and fairly. How could any one say in his heart that they could rise on 24th August and yet give all these Bills adequate discussion? The Prime Minister himself would not say that. And what was left out of the list? Although they did not want to be unreasonable, those interested in social reform could not but be impatient when they saw that at the present rate of progress twenty years would be required to redeem pledges given not two years ago. If they were impatient of the progress made, the Government could see why it was so. One did not wish to use offensive language, but after his experience of last session and of this, what he had to say was that there was too much purposed and deliberate killing of time. They in that portion of the House were perfectly amazed at the extent to which this was carried on. Hon. Members said in the course of the evening when there were three or four Bills that the Government expected to get through that they could only give them one. That was the reverse process to what the country expected of the House. The country did not expect the House to give them hurried legislation, but they did expect the House not to waste its time so as to prevent a Government, whether it was Liberal or Conservative, getting measures through. He felt bound to say these things, and he ventured to express the opinion that the vast majority of earnest politicians outside the House, not on one side but on all sides, would associate themselves with him in what he said. As to the business which had been laid before them, they were exceedingly sorry that the Laundries Bill was not to be proceeded with. It was in the doubtful list, as there were some objections to it. Those objections must be debated and voted upon, for they could not be negotiated. The right hon. Gentleman knew that there were certain clauses in that Bill which must be retained if it was to be satisfactory to those interested in the proper inspection of laundries. No round table conference could get rid of the difficulties: it was a question of a fight on the floor of the House and a division between the "Ayes" and the "Noes." Therefore he regretted that the Bill should be on the doubtful list, because it meant that it was doomed to death. Then there was the Scottish Education Bill, which also might be put in the list of Bills which were dead, because it could not be carried through with the other Scottish business before the middle of August. It had to follow the Scottish Valuation Bill on the Scottish Committee and would not be reached until within a few days of Members going for their holidays. Although the Scottish Education Bill was dead he would venture to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman about one section of it. The Bill was a composite one and dealt with twenty or thirty subjects, but one subject which it dealt with, that of the feeding of underfed children, he had greatly at heart, and the Secretary for Scotland had pledged himself to see it carried. When the Bill dealing with this question came from the House of Lords last year, the Premier made strong reflections on the Upper Chamber in regard to their action. He himself had a little Bill on that subject which was still alive and had reached the Committee stage. It did not propose anything which the House had not already decided should be done. The House passed the Second Reading of this Scottish Feeding Bill by an overwhelming majority. The Bill went upstairs and the Secretary for Scotland came there and said they intended to push their measure through. The Secretary for Scotland gave a pledge upon that, and having given it the Committee adopted a certain procedure. He had warned the Committee at the time of what might happen, but he kept his Bill alive. It was a small Bill which dealt with this feeding question and it could be "starred" and settled in half a day. He urged that it would be desirable to make the law of Scotland conform to the law of England, and for that purpose he hoped the Government would give that half day. They would have liked to have seen a Housing Bill this session, if only for the sake of its being printed and discussed in the autumn. He presumed they were going to have a Miners' Eight Hour Bill printed for the purposes of discussion. Then there was another question, that of Supply. It was felt in all quarters of the House and even amongst the supporters of the Government that there should be one more day for Supply in order that they might have a discussion on the Vote for the Local Government Board. There were most important questions of local administration involved in the Vote, which dealt with such matters as the unemployed and other municipal points, in which the country took keen interest, and he hoped the extra day woud be given.

Mr. S. T. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said he wished to call the attention of the House to the conditions under which it did its work. He also desired to congratulate and bear testimony to the excellent manner in which the Labour Members had endeavoured to get work done in the House of Commons. The mischief was that in their debates there was a great deal of absolutely irrelevant talk. He made bold to say that if they examined *Hansard*, pretty nearly half of the hundreds of pages would be found to contain observations which could not be said to have a business quality in any sense. All this must lead ultimately to each Member of the House asking himself whether he was doing his duty in presenting observations of that character. It had been hoped that the establishment of Standing Committees would have expedited the business of the House, but that could only be if the House accepted the spirit in which those Committees were set up. After the House had passed the principles of a measure and read it a second time, the Committee upstairs ought to be simply a business assembly with a desire to carry out principles already acceded to in the House. He himself thought that the Prime Minister should have had an autumn session this year. There was a great desire for it on both sides. At present the length of the session depended entirely upon the state of the weather. If the weather got hot Members became tired, and legislation went through. Was it really sensible that the first legislative assembly in the world should have its business conducted on those lines? If the Government had adjourned the House in the middle of July, Members could have come back fresh in October, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean had exposed the hollowness of the argument that Ministers could not prepare their Bills if there was an autumn session. He implored the Government not to repeat in the next session of Parliament, or the session after, the great error of not adjourning in July and meeting again in October. He would suggest that the rules of the House should be so altered that Bills could be carried over to the next session and their consideration then resumed at the stage they had reached in the previous session. The present system of dropping measures with the session was an unjustifiable waste of time and energy on the part of men who should aim at doing their Parliamentary work on business lines.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Wimbledon) welcomed the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because he thought it pointed to a desire to return to the better traditions of the House. There could be no doubt that in recent years there had been a decadence in the general tone and procedure of the House, and it would be well if those who had the best interests of the House at heart were to consider whether some remedy could be devised. The reason at the root of the present state of affairs was that which a great and distinguished man who was long the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Gladstone) had expressed to him privately, namely, the want of deference to the general sense and feeling of the House of Commons which in former days prevailed. Would it not be possible to restore, in some degree at all events, that position of affairs? He agreed with his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition that to go back to the former state of things which prevailed in the House of Commons for so many years would be impossible, but if that was impossible, at least they could do something. In those days there were old habits and practices in this House, and a system which was very effective, of individual closure, which enforced the general sense and feeling of the House. He did not say that was a remedy which he should recommend, because when the House expressed its feelings by shouting, "Divide, divide!" although it showed that somebody was doing something against its freedom, such proceedings did not add to the elevation of its debates. He thought that rules for the closure of individuals might, however, be devised which would do something in the direction of restoring the state of things that used to prevail. He had been provoked into making his observations more or less by the speech of the hon. Member for Leicester, whose observations throughout he had heard with the greatest pleasure. Returning to the observations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. Gentleman had referred to the Scottish Land Bill and expressed astonishment because that Bill had been in Committee since 7th May, had not been returned to the House, and would not be returned to the House before the middle of August. What did that mean? That Scottish Land Bill was the greatest revolution which had ever been put forward in this country. It was a Bill of the very highest importance, which was not only entitled to receive but demanded the most careful consideration in Committee. What did that long consideration mean? The Bill had been before the Committee for twenty-two days, but that only meant eleven Parliamentary days in the House. The Prime Minister would recollect the great discussions on the Irish Land Bills of Mr. Gladstone in 1870 and 1881, and it was impossible to conceive that there should have been only eleven days in Committee in reference to either of those Bills. He had made no reference to find out the time those Bills did occupy in Committee, but he was certain, speaking from memory, that he should not be very far wrong if he were to say, especially with regard to the larger measure of 1881 which was the more revolutionary that it occupied at least eleven days in Committee. The Bill which was now before the Committee upstairs in regard to Scotland was not one whit less important than the great measure passed by Mr. Gladstone to which he had alluded.

Mr. BRACE (Glamorganshire, S.) said he was very much impressed with the arguments as to the unnecessary speeches which were made in the House, and therefore he did not propose to make any speech but to observe the very good rule which had been laid down. He simply rose to make an appeal to the Prime Minister. He noticed that the Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill was upon the orders of the day for Committee. That was a Bill in which he was deeply interested, as were also a number of other Members. The Bill had been referred to a Select Committee, but the Report of that Committee had not been placed upon the Table of the House, and he simply suggested that the consideration of the Bill should be put off until the Report was before the House, so that Members might know where they were.

He hoped the Prime Minister would not put the Bill on the Paper for a week.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) protested against the observations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the amount of discussion which should take place in that House on the Bills which had been before a Grand Committee. He pointed out that, when the new Standing Orders were discussed, it was stated by the Government that full opportunity would be given to the House to discuss these Bills, and for this purpose the Government enlarged the powers of debate on the Report stage. A very important discussion took place upon that point and those who sat in Opposition only agreed to the alteration on the condition that the Government intended to conduct the debate on Report on the same lines as debate in Committee. If these Bills were to be taken under the extreme limits of the guillotine the only effect of the concession made in the Standing Order would be to give more time to the Government and less to the House. He thought some protest ought to be made.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said this discussion was an annual one and this year there was exceptional interest taken in it. There was a unanimous feeling in the House that for some reason or other the Parliamentary machinery for carrying on the business of the country had broken down. That at the end of July forty measures were mentioned as having to be passed into law during the last three weeks of the session was clear evidence of the machinery having broken down. Two remedies for this condition of things had been mentioned. One of those might be carried out with very little trouble, namely, that Bills should be carried over from one session to another. There was one Bill that might be dealt with in that way, namely, the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, which had been before the House for many years. It was simply a scandal that year after year that Bill should go through its various stages and then not be passed into law. But the great remedy for the present state of affairs was that suggested by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean—a system of national assemblies in the different countries of Great Britain. An hon. Member had alluded to Scotland, and he had waited before rising for a more authoritative voice than his to reply to the hon. Member. But as no one had risen he rose to protest as strongly as he could against the dropping of the Education Bill for Scotland this year. That the education of Scotland should be paralysed in this way was a scandal. In seven years they had had five Education Bills dangled before their eyes, and there was no man more convinced than the Prime Minister of the gravity of the educational situation in Scotland. Scotsmen had every reason for feeling aggrieved in this matter. Six Scottish Bills had been put into the doubtful list. Why he did not know. But it meant that those Bills for all practical purposes were dead for this year. [Cries of "No."] He hoped that was not so, but so far as the Scottish Valuation Bill and the Sheriff Courts Bill were concerned he believed they were dead. There was yet another Bill, introduced it was true by a private Member, for which there was prime need in Scotland, a Local Option Bill, which had no chance of passing this year. He had now entered his protest with regard to these matters, and he trusted the result of this year's debate would be to convince hon. Members that there was no other remedy for the breakdown of the Parliamentary machine than the scheme of devolution suggested by the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean.

Mr. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he came with many of the other new Members to this House with a great zeal for social reform. He came believing that this Assembly had in itself the power to improve the condition of the great mass of the people of this country, and he believed the Prime Minister had much sympathy with a good many of the social problems which were pressing for solution at the present time. But during the eighteen months which he had been a Member he had been disillusioned. No one knew better than the Members of the Scottish Grand Committee that this House had not that power. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had called attention to the fact that the Scottish Small Holdings Bill had been under discussion for three months. The Committee had met twice a week and the spectacle of a small knot of men working together and farming out carefully framed Amendments with the avowed intention of embarrassing the Government and preventing them from passing the Bill was viewed by the public with disgust. The right hon. Member for South Dublin had a great crowd of men behind the bar where the public were allowed, and he was informed that most of them were legal and other gentlemen interested who were cudgelling their brains to bring about Amendments. Some hon. Members who believed that land reform in Scotland was pressing had been discouraged by the tactics that were brought into operation in that Grand Committee, and considered that they were making Parliament a by-word. He had a strong suspicion that within a short space of time, unless constitutional measures were brought into operation, unconstitutional methods would be adopted by certain Members of the House. So far as the Scottish Bill was concerned he had come to the conclusion that there ought to be a time limit. The hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London said when he was a candidate for this House that he could talk for any length of time on any subject, and so far as the Scottish Grand Committee was concerned he had justified the character which he then gave himself. Not only so, but the hon. Member was always in the House at eleven o'clock to utter the words "I object" when any private Member's Bill was put to the House. He knew nothing about the contents of them and came down to the House for the purpose of pure obstruction.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London): That is not true.

Mr. SEDDON said there was one Bill in particular to which he referred which the hon. Gentleman knew nothing about. He thought the present House of Commons, generally speaking, had come with a determination that something should be done, and he was not filled with awe for old traditions. What was good might be retained, but let them destroy what was antiquated and worthless. With some reorganisation much might be done to redeem the pledges given by Members to their constituents who had made up their minds as to the legislation they required by which the lot of the unfortunate should be made better than it was at the present time.

Sir F. BANBURY said that the hon. Member who had just spoken had stated that the public would view with disgust the proceedings in the Scottish Committee. With that he quite agreed, but he thought the disgust would arise because of the attempt of hon. Members opposite to force through revolutionary measures without adequate or proper discussion. With regard to the personal attack which had been made upon him he might say that he had not taken a prominent part in the proceedings after eleven o'clock. He was always present, and had always felt, and always should feel, that the House was not doing its duty as a House of Commons in passing Bills without discussion simply because one or two Members were interested in them. During the time he took a prominent part, if ever he did, he always read the Bill, and with regard to the particular Bill referred to by the hon. Member he might tell him that it was a Bill to prevent an employer making an agreement with one of his clerks or workmen in the shop that that man should not set up for himself when he left.

Mr. SEDDON said the chief clause of that Bill was to restrict the area in which an employer should prevent a man earning his livelihood.

Sir F. BANBURY said that was just what he had said. It would be out of order to refer further to the matter, and he only referred to it to show that he was cognisant of the Bill. With regard to the proceedings in the Scottish Committee, the right hon. Member for Wimbledon had pointed out that the proceedings in that Committee on the Small Holdings Bill had lasted twenty-two days, which was equivalent to eleven Parliamentary days. The Education Bill brought in by the Party to which he belonged occupied thirty days before the closure was adopted, whereas in the Scottish Committee up to the last two or three days he did not think there had been a day in which the closure had not been moved. He had endeavoured to find out how many contentious clauses had been passed on the question that "this clause stand part," and out of twenty only two had been passed in that way. As hon. Members knew, the question gave rise to most important discussions, and out of twenty of the contentious clauses eighteen had been passed under the closure without any discussion whatever. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was only present on one of those twenty-two days. Ministers did not attend at the House. The Prime Minister came to Questions and then left. He hoped if the House was to be kept sitting until the middle of October the right hon. Gentleman would give them the pleasure of his company. With regard to the crowds of men in the public part of the Scottish Committee-room, he did not understand the hon. Gentleman's reference. Not only did the Government have the assistance of clerks and officials who sat by the side of the Chairman, but also the assistance of the Lord-Advocate and the Attorney-General for Scotland, whilst the Opposition had not a single official to assist them. With regard to the congestion of business, his proceedings in the Grand Committee had been conducted not with the object of killing the Bill, as had been stated, but with the view of amending it and making it more workable. That was the only feeling by which he had been actuated. The real reason why the House was in its present position was the action of the Government, who had endeavoured to put too many measures through all at once. Hon. Members prepared themselves for coming into the House by giving all sorts of pledges, and then they were astonished that they were not able to get all things dealt with in two sessions of Parliament. They would not return to the old conditions of Parliament until they recognised that they could not pass every Bill that was brought in because one or two people were interested in it. The measures passed should be those that were supported by a great part of the House and should be measures of an important character, and nothing could be worse than that they should be passed in the early hours of the morning. The only reason for the present condition of things was the endeavour to force upon the House a greater number of Bills than it was capable of receiving. He mentioned the matter recently to the Patronage Secretary, and he would quote the hon. Gentleman's own statement to him—

> "The Bills brought in by this Parliament are enough for three ordinary sessions."

He deprecated the idea that the House of Commons, which for 600 or 700 years had occupied the most prominent position of any deliberative assembly in the world, was going to stultify itself by allowing every little vestry to pass what Bills it required. If they once allowed Scotland, Ireland, and Wales to do this and adopted the scheme of devolution suggested, they would very soon have to have devolution for north, south, east, and west, and every county in England. If a Bill was a very important one it required to be considered with great care and deliberation. A few measures passed in that way would do more good than a great number passed in a hurry in order to carry out pledges that had been given. He himself did not want to stay here till October, and the Bills put down by the Patronage Secretary could not be got through before; but, whatever the hon. Member who last spoke might say of him, nobody could say he was afraid of work.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.) said it had been the desire of Scottish Members that more attention should be given to Scottish legislation, and they had hoped that progress would be made by means of the Grand Committee. Their hopes, however, had been disappointed, and he thought there must be devolution if Scottish legislation was to have any chance.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he desired to put in a word on behalf of the Education Act (Amendment) Bill. He ventured to make an appeal to the Prime Minister, as he had done on a former occasion. The Bill now stood for Third Reading. It was a Bill affecting public health as well as education, and was a most important measure. He thought that there never was a Bill which contained more valuable matter, and he believed that if it passed the House of Commons it would receive the sanction of the other House.

*MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs) said he rose to ask the Government whether they could not see their way to putting the Scottish Education Bill into the list of those that should pass. The subject of feeding school children was in the Bill of last session and was cut out at the last moment in order to save the English Bill. Parliament must have some regard to making provision for feeding school children in Scotland. There were many other points with regard to education in which Scotland had to be considered. As had been said, five Education Bills had been brought in in seven years for Scotland, and not one had been passed. As one who was intimately connected with the educational problem of Scotland he could testify to the way in which education had been paralysed by the non-passing of those measures. He asked the Patronage Secretary to make an exception of the Education Bill. It would be very difficult for the *ad hoc* school boards of Scotland to continue their work satisfactorily unless that Bill was passed this session.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that frequently in the Scottish Grand Committee the numbers of those who spoke on the Government side had exceeded those on the Opposition side. On one occasion seventeen Members supporting the Government spoke against seven of the Opposition. The Solicitor-General for Scotland would not, he was sure, accuse the Scottish Committee of having unduly prolonged the proceedings or taken more time than was necessary shortly to express their views on the difficulties that arose. The block of business had been caused by the Government's sending to that Committee a measure so highly controversial in character. In regard to the Scottish Education Bill it must be remembered that in regard to one provision in that Bill—the Provision of Meals — the Government had been trying to run two measures together—a Bill of a private Member, and one of their own which dealt with the same subject matter. He himself was reproached by the Prime Minister in November last for having influenced the decision on that Bill in another place. The right hon. Gentleman said that that Bill ought to have passed, and would have passed but for the action he (Sir Henry Craik) had taken, and said that he had been guilty of an unparliamentary and improper action. But nevertheless the Government themselves this session introduced a Bill of their own, on the same subject, but on entirely different lines. They had resolved to allow the Bill of the hon. Member below the gangway to go on, with the possibility that it might be taken as a starred measure. They had been running these two measures together, and now they must know before the Scottish Education Bill came on what procedure the Government were going to adopt—whether they were going to adopt the measure on which they lavished time last session, but which they did not adopt as their own this session, or whether they determined to push their own very different measure. He must point out that although this Education Bill was one which, in Scotland, it was desired to see passed, and on which it was thought that they might arrive at a satisfactory decision, common prudence and foresight should have led the Government to infer that there were elements of opposition to the measure on their own side of the House. They would find no obstructive opposition on his side. He was as anxious as anyone could be to help what was so urgently needed in Scotland in order to put an end to the suspense which had been experienced in regard to Scottish education for the last five or six years. He was ready to do what he could, but he was not going to accept an emasculated Bill, and with important provisions regarding the teachers' pensions cut out because of the opposition of hon. Members behind the right hon. Gentleman and on the benches below the gangway. He would not undertake the responsibility for Scotland of obstructing the Bill, but neither would he take responsibility for Scotland in passing the Bill in the shape which he could see would not do good to Scotland and would not meet her educational necessities. He thought the measure might have been more satisfactorily dealt with if the Government, instead of sending the most controversial Small Landholders Bill to the Grand Committee, had left it—as any sensible men would have done—to be dealt with by the House, and sent the Education Bill as an uncontroversial measure to the Grand Committee to be dealt with by the Scottish Members acting in concert with one another. Had they done so, the Education Bill might easily have passed into law.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said that before the discussion closed there was one question to which he thought they ought to have an answer from the Government. Was it their intention to star any private Member's Bills? During the fifteen years he had been in the House he did not think there had ever been a Motion of this kind made by the Prime Minister without clear indications either that the business would be confined to Government Bills or of any particular Bill which it was proposed to star. It was conceivable—though he did not know whether it was so or not—that there might be private Member's Bills of an entirely non-contentious character which it might be desirable to star by common consent of the House. The hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan had spoken of a Bill of which he knew nothing, though it was quite clear that before the Government received powers to keep them day and night they ought to have some assurance that they were not going to use those powers to star contentious private Member's Bills. If they were to use their powers at all, then the Bill suggested by his hon. friend behind him might be a proper one, though he did not know whether it was or not; but it was only in cases where the Bill would go through *nemine contradicente*, with the good will and free sanction of the House, that the powers should be exercised. He trusted that they would have an answer from someone on the Government Bench. He wanted to add a word or two as to the condition of business and the position in which they found themselves; he did not think that position had yet been fully stated to the House. He never recollected an occasion where the Finance Bill had not been passed and sent to another place before this period of the session. And it was now proposed that the Third Reading of that Bill should be put down, not as the first order of the day, as had been the invariable practice ever since there had been a Finance Bill, but after a Motion as to another matter which he should heartily support, but which he had reason to believe was likely to give rise to a contentious and angry discussion in other quarters of the House. He suggested that the Prime Minister might find another occasion for the Third Reading of the Finance Bill when it could be the first order of the day. He thought that was not unreasonable, and he urged that the Third Reading of the Bill should not be taken towards the dinner time, still less after dinner. The Prime Minister had made no allusion to the allotted days for Supply. If there was one subject in which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite professed a special interest, and in regard to which they announced to the country that they were going to effect great reforms when they came into office, it was the conduct of the financial business of the House. They had repeatedly stated that insufficient time had been given to the control of the financial business of the House, and that they intended to pursue a policy of economy and to restore the control of the House of Commons over finance. What was the case this year? If the Prime Minister did not alter his programme they were going to have less time for Supply this year than they had in any year in recent times. The Party who were the champions of financial purity and control of the House of Commons were content to smuggle through Supply with less control than the House had ever had. The Government had just tabled a Supplementary Estimate for £560,000. He could not help overhearing what the Financial Secretary had said to his colleague, that £200,000 of that Supplementary Estimate was provided for in the Budget, but there still remained of the £560,000 sufficient to wipe out the Chancellor of the Exchequer's surplus. And the hon. Gentleman who voluntarily thrust himself forward to defend this Supplementary Estimate had been one of the foremost to condemn such a procedure. Was it not a remarkable thing that when the legislative programme was so notoriously in arrear the Government had not been able to make satisfactory arrangements for the discussion of the financial business of the House? Among the Bills announced as being necessary to be carried was one which was obviously indispensable, and one which the right hon. Gentleman considered as hardly calling for comment.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not say that it did not need comment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he wanted to remind the Prime Minister that the Appropriation Bill was more contentious this year owing to the action of the Government than it had ever been before, because the Minister for Education and the Prime Minister deliberately asked the House of Commons to break the law by means of it. That did not make the Appropriation Bill less arguable or likely to pass more smoothly than hitherto. The Appropriation Bill was this year to contain a clause which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised in order to carry out certain requirements of the Controller and Auditor-General and certain recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised the hon. Member for Norwood, unless he was much mistaken, that he should have an opportunity for discussion which he was prevented from obtaining in the ordinary way at an earlier period of the session by the interposition of a blocking notice in the name of an hon. Member opposite, between the time when his question was put down and the time the Chancellor of the Exchequer was able to answer him. The Appropriation Bill, therefore, became more important than in ordinary years. Then there was the Transvaal Loan Bill. He agreed that the Committee stage of that Bill would not give rise to prolonged discussion like a large and complicated legislative proposal, but he could conceive of no more amazing measure. There had been various explanations of it from the Government. It was a measure of preference in its worst and most invidious form. It was not preference between a British community as against foreigners; it was preference of one British community against other British communities, with a detrimental effect to the position of the others in the money market of the United Kingdom.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): Who gave them £30,000,000 after the war?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked what inference the hon. Member drew from that? Was his interruption relevant? They gave the grant to a Crown Colony; they had often given grants to Crown Colonies before and might have to do so again; but they had to go back more than thirty years to find a precedent for giving guarantee of the loan of a self-governing Colony, and they had to justify themselves for doing it at a time when they knew that it was difficult for every other Colony that wanted money to raise their loans. And they had to justify themselves for doing it, also, by raising a new loan on a Government guarantee at home, though, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated, his first duty was to raise the credit of this country by stopping its borrowings. It was certainly not a measure which ought to be discussed late at night or in the early hours of the morning; it was one on which the House, if it cared at all about its duty as guardian of the public purse and the public credit, ought to insist upon having full, free, and fair opportunity for discussion. Having said so much, might he say one word about the situation generally? They had begun the session with an amendment of the Rules of Procedure. The Prime Minister in explaining the backward state of legislation said it was because they had occupied a good deal of time in dealing with the Rules of Procedure; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer following his right hon. friend behind him, had said that they had occupied very little time upon them. If the latter statement were correct it afforded no explanation of the position in which they found themselves. But what he wished to call the attention of the House to was that the new scheme of procedure by which Bills were referred to Grand Committees had wholly broken down, and one after another on both sides of the House, had expressed disappointment and almost dismay at the result of the new rules, which excluded the bulk of Members from taking any share in the proceedings on the most important measures of the session, and, in spite of having done that. In spite of having used the guillotine, the Government were more behindhand with their legislation; they had reduced the House to greater impotency and ineffectiveness than he had ever known during all the years he had been a Member of that Assembly. They might deduce from the statements of Ministers that they were going to apply the guillotine with added stringency when the Bills came downstairs. The Chancellor of the Excehquer said it could not be that the Scottish Bills would take long on Report, because they had been fully discussed upstairs. By whom? By eighty Members. Were the other 590 Members to have no voice in any of these questions? The position was seen to be preposterous the moment it was stated. What the Government had done was to proceed on the wrong lines when they reformed procedure. They had an opportunity of dealing with procedure with general acceptance and agreement between both sides of the House. If they had begun with such a proposal as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had mentioned that day, the Government had reason to know from past declarations of many on his side of the House that such a proposal would have received not merely fair, but friendly consideration. But they determined not to act on any suggestion which their predecessors or their opponents had made, nor to avail themselves of any offers of assistance. The new rules had completely broken down. Experience showed that the Opposition were right in regard to them. Let the House look at the list of Bills which the Prime Minister had read out; it was inconceivable that the Government intended to allow the House a fair opportunity of discussing those Bills on Report, and yet expected their proceedings to end on the 24th August or the 24th of the following month.

Mr. MARKHAM rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put"; but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN joined in the expression of regret which his right hon. friend had used earlier in the debate at the position in which they found themselves. He agreed that reform of procedure was necessary in the altered circumstances of the case, but surely that should be proposed by those who were responsible, and such a proposal would meet with support from all quarters where they valued the dignity of the House. If it was necessary to curtail their liberties in matters of procedure at least for great and contentious measures, there should be a fair opportunity for the whole House to consider them, and express its opinion upon them. There was nothing more wholly untrue than the idea that speeches in the House never changed votes. Again and again he had known votes changed in that way. What often happened was that the effect of speeches was that no vote was necessary, because those in charge of the question under discussion felt bound by the force of the arguments to modify and alter their proposals. The value of discussion in modifying and improving measures had been large in the past and might be so in the future; but if they treated discussion as a mere work of supererogation and an obstacle interposed to delay the registration of the will of a Ministry they would be doing their best to confirm the false impression that Members did not listen to argument, or speeches influence votes, and they would be striking a most serious blow at Parliament as a representative institution.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.), who was received with cries of "Divide divide," said that hon. Members were mistaken if they imagined that he was going to be put down by clamour. He thought the remarks of his right hon. friend deserved a reply from the Government. The House would do well to give attention to the candid criticism of the hon. Member for Leicester upon the present position. He had listened with interest to the speech of the hon. Member, and they all felt that it was a very candid criticism. The hon. Member for Leicester had said that the reputation and the position of the House were suffering, that the machinery of legislation had broken down, and that those who came to the House with high hopes of carrying through great measures of social reform had been disillusioned. That was a very serious matter, and the House might well spare some time discussing a question of that magnitude. He thought the position of the House had become very serious. It was suffering in popular estimation, and they had nothing to take its place from a constitutional point of view. He did not believe in devolution; it was an absurdity. Hon. Members below the gangway hoped to get Home Rule, but even they must realise that they could not get it from the present Ministry. But even Home Rule would be a miserable remedy for the present state of things, for it would only remove one or two Bills from this Parliament. The inevitable result of Home Rule would be that they would have to grant devolution to Scotland, and everybody knew that that would be impracticable. He agreed with the hon. Member that the House had suffered in the popular estimation, and rules would be ineffective until there was a different spirit in Members of the House. ["Hear, hear."] He was glad to hear the Prime Minister cheer that, for the right hon. Gentleman was, not personally but officially, the root and front of the evil. ["Oh."] It was the Cabinet system, the rigidity of the Party system, which was at the bottom of the trouble. No speech was given the chance of influencing opinion in the House. Within the last few days they had seen the whole Party machinery set in motion, at the bidding of the Ministry, against Members who had ventured to vote against their Party, and that had been done in the past by either Party. So long as that system prevailed there would be no inducement to direct argument to the merits of a subject, and recourse could only be had to indirect methods of opposition, methods he disliked and condemned, but which were the only methods until the spirit by which the House was governed and the country directed was altered. Unless Members of the House and the people of the country were prepared to take a sounder view there would be no hope of the House being restored to anything like its former position. Although he thought something might be done with reference to non-controversial measures he did not think that any alteration of the position of that House would free them from the incompetence and chaos which they found themselves in this year. He trusted that the Government would answer the Questions which had been put by his right hon. friend.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN recognised the clearness and calmness of the noble Lord in his wish for abolition of the Party system.

LORD R. CECIL: Its modification.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said it was surprising, seeing that the noble Lord not long since voted for a Motion he said he did not agree with.

LORD R. CECIL said he was sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but he was sure that the Prime Minister would search his Parliamentary career in vain for any such instance. He had never voted for a Motion which he had said he did not agree with.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he had some difficulty in reconciling that explanation with what the noble Lord said in regard to his vote upon the Colonial preference Resolution, when he stated that he voted for the Motion not because he liked it, but because the Government favoured another proposal.

LORD R. CECIL said the right hon. Gentleman must have been misled by an imperfect report, for he had said nothing in the least resembling what had been attributed to him or anything which would bear the interpretation which had been placed upon his words.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said there had been a useful discussion, which had included an instructive speech from the hon. Member for Leicester and a violent diatribe from the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire, and there seemed to be an idea that the whole Parliamentary machine was out of joint. He was at one with the hon. Member for Leicester, and in introducing his proposals for altering the rules of procedure stated his belief that the House devoted far too much time to the discussion of small matters, and that the forms of the House were not calculated to secure the passage of well-considered legislation approved by the House. There was a debate on the Second Reading of a Bill in which considerable difference of opinion was shown, and then the House came to a decision by an overwhelming vote. But then the difficulties began, because those who were opposed to the main purpose of the Bill had opportunities under the forms of the House for preventing a measure passing, by discussing, criticising, and analysing the minutest details, and the process was intended to prevent the Bill passing into law. Unless the House devolved some of the details of its duty in the discussion of Bills, it was impossible for it to transact the business which its duty to the public required. He had put aside the question of devolution in his first speech. He was in favour of it. That, no doubt, was the radical cure; but, accepting the situation as it was, and admitting that devolution on an effective scale could not be accomplished without great difficulty and expenditure of time, he maintained that sending Bills to be considered in their details by Committees and then allowing them to be reconsidered by the House when they had gone through that process was the way to get through the business they were expected to effect for the country. He was, however, entirely at one with the hon. Member for Leicester in the view that even any such plan as that must fail if it was not loyally carried out, and if hon. Members took part in the proceedings with a view of doing that which it was not intended to do—namely, to destroy the measure they were dealing with. What they ought to do, of course, was to set themselves, as strenuously as they could, to improve the measure, acknowledging and admitting the purpose for which it was intended. He had been told that a number of Members on the Scottish Committee devoted themselves to minute and elaborate discussion of small details, with the result that an inordinate time had been devoted to the Small Landholders Bill, to which reference had been made. A case like that proved nothing against the system of sending Bills to a Committee; because the system had not been rightly tried in that case. He did not say it was not natural for Members, finding themselves in a very small minority on a Committee, and holding strong opinions on what, he supposed, they would say was the iniquity of a Bill, to endeavour to kill the Bill in this manner; but it was not carrying out the intentions of the House when it passed the new rules and regulations. He hoped that as Members became more accustomed to this mode of dealing with business, there would be less tendency to adopt these unhealthy methods, and that they would come more nearly back to the old relations between hon. Members when they happened to differ on legislative measures.

Mr. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.) as a member of the minority on the Scottish Committee, challenged the Prime Minister to give some specific instance in support of his charge.

Sir H. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN said the fact that the Bill had been all these weeks in Committee was in itself conclusive evidence that some Members of the Committee departed from the intention of the new procedure. [Cries of "No."]

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) rose amid cries of "Order," but the Prime Minister did not give way.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN did not himself see the decadence observed by the right hon. Member for Wimbledon since their own early Parliamentary days. There used to be a closure adopted by Members themselves crying "'Vide, 'vide," when one of their number talked against the general feeling. They did not wish to restore that method of dealing with long and unnecessary speeches; and the House, so far from showing any signs of decadence, had immensely improved in the zeal, knowledge, and intelligence of its members. Their difficulty had been largely created by the fact that there were so many Members well-informed on the subjects in hand, and capable of speaking with effect upon them. That was one of the reasons why this process of sending measures to a Committee was an experiment deserving of trial. He had always been an opponent of long speeches and lengthy debate, and he was sorry to miss his old friend the Member for Chelmsford, who had kept before them the ideal of short speeches. If they were to preserve for the House the respect of the country, they must, as had been said in the debate, put restraint upon themselves, and remember that it was not loyal to the House to spin out one debate to prevent another coming on. He did not speak of embarrassing the Government. It was a question more serious—the restriction of measures that could be passed. He trusted that what had been said that day would be valuable as showing, not only to the House, but to the country, where the mischief really lay, and in what way, by giving the new rules and conditions a fair trial, they might find relief from a state of things which was not creditable to the House. With regard to the particular question as to facilities for a private Member's Bill he was not going to say anything about that now. At this time of the session a private Member's Bill ought to be either unanimously supported or to be recommended by some special circumstances in order to justify facilities being now given to it. Until they had proceeded a little further with their own business they had better not take up other people's. As to Tuesday night and the danger of the Finance Bill not coming on until an unduly late hour because of the prolongation of the discussion on Lord Cromer's Grant, he admitted that, in view of the immense dignity and importance of the Finance Bill, it ought not to be brought forward at the fag end of a sitting, and if he found that, according to past practice, the Cromer Grant could be taken after the Finance Bill, that measure would be taken as the first Order and the Cromer Grant next. As to the request for an extra day for Supply in order to discuss the Local Government Board Vote, it was quite impossible to grant that. There had been sporadic discussions during the session of questions of local government, and there were, of course, other opportunities to which he need not allude for the discussion of particular points.

MR. LAMBTON said he had no intention of taking part in the debate but for the attack of the Prime Minister on the minority of the Scottish Standing Committee. The right hon. Gentleman acknowledged, himself, that he spoke without any personal knowledge of the subject. He did not know whence the right hon. Gentleman got his information. He had said that the proceedings of the Committee that considered the Scottish Small Landholders Bill showed it had been subjected to undue obstruction or discussion and, in fact, that discussion had been improperly conducted on the part of the minority of the Committee. When the Bill went into Committee some of the newspapers stated that five days were wasted over four lines. That might seem to some to be obstruction, and as he saw the Solicitor-General in his place he would ask him whether he would not acknowledge that the discussion on those four lines was absolutely justified. If the right hon. Gentleman would refer to the Decalogue he would find that many of the most important commands were contained in one line, and he challenged any hon. Member to get up and say that five days would have been wasted in discussing the four words of the eighth Commandment. He maintained that the discussion which had taken place in the Scottish Standing Committee on this particular Bill had not been a waste of time. Small details were discussed by the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty and others, but when information was asked upon really serious questions the closure was put on. The discussions in the Committee had not been of greater length than they ought to have been. Members never knew when the closure was going to be sprung upon them. Clause 14 was put to the Committee without any discussion at all. The Prime Minister had made a most unfounded charge.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY rose to continue the discussion.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 236; Noes 57. (Division List No. 325.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball

Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W.C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson, J.W.H.(S'mers't, E.)
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D.S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarthn)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G.(Winchest'r)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt HnJ.A.(Worc.
Clark, George Smith(Belfast, N.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darling'n)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wards, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 233 ; Noes, 58. (Division List No. 326.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, NE.).
Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. HerbertHenry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, SirJ.H.(Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, RtHnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, SirJ. A.(Inverness-sh.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, RtHn. SirW. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George

Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, D. Thomas J.
MacNeill John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards,T.L.(Wolverhampton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil,Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Clark,GeorgeSmith(Belfast,N.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doulgas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Ed'mds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Roberts,S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)

Starkey, John R.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the session, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour, though opposed; that, at the conclusion of Government Business each day, Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11.

———

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Order for Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

*MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) moved that the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee. He said that although the Bill had passed its Second Reading in the House, when it went to the Committee upstairs it was found on every division that there was very substantial support from all sections of the House against some of the sections of the measure, and he hoped that they would have a final statement that afternoon as to what the view of the Government was in regard to the Bill. The importance of the subject could be realised from the fact that the annual value of the butter trade of this country was over £21,000,000. Pure butter and margarine were only allowed by the existing law to contain 16 per cent. of water. During recent years, owing to the practice of scientific adulteration by certain foreign firms, a new article had been brought into the commerce of Great Britain. It was called by various names but preferably "milk-blended butter." Nobody would deny that that article was a fraudulent article; it was really a water-loaded butter. It had lately been sold under various certificates by enterprising firms, whereby the public were imposed upon. The water-loaded butter was sold with a declaration which conveyed nothing to the average man and woman, much less that they were buying an article which contained 50 per cent. of water, whereas pure butter or margarine contained only 16 per cent. He was sorry to say that the recent Select Committee had more or less provided for the continuance of the sale of this article in the British market. He opposed legislation of this kind, not only on behalf of the agricultural constituency which he represented, but on behalf of all the trade interested in the distribution of pure butter and also of margarine, which was a wholesome substitute for butter. All legislation ought to be passed for the protection of the public at large. He took it that if this measure passed the foreign wealthy capitalists who were behind it would be legally entitled to commit still greater frauds in the future than in the past. Some estimate could be formed of the profitableness of the trade in the past by the fact that the penalties inflicted had in no way acted as a deterrent to the manufacture and sale of the article. The magistrates began by imposing fines of £5 for each offence, but they had been gradually increased to £120 and £30 costs. Still the manufacture and sale went on and the manufacture had grown in prosperity. The Bill was remarkable for many things. The wealthy capitalists behind the Bill seemed to have captured the hon. Baronet in charge of it. It was also remarkable for the fact that it was framed in direct opposition to the expert evidence given by all the permanent officials connected with the Agricultural Department. These men were well-known and had a sense of responsibility, and their reputation for giving reliable evidence before Select Committees was at stake. They declared not only that this milk-blended butter was an illicit manufacture, but that manufacture should be prohibited.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Gentleman's argument was good as against the Bill as a whole; but it was not directed against the recommittal of the Bill, which was the only question before the House.

*MR. BARRIE said he would address himself to that point. The Select Committee of this year seemed to have reported in opposition to the report of a previous Select Committee presided over by the late Mr. Hanbury. The latter Select Committee reported that if this article was permitted to be sold at all it should not contain more than 16 per cent. of water. The whole of the agricultural interest throughout Great Britain and the Irish Agricultural Department were strongly opposed to the provisions relating to milk-blended butter, and so were the trading interests. Parliament was the guardian of the interests of the public, who could not organise opposition to the Bill. He thought that these grounds were all-important and worthy of the consideration of the House, and therefore he moved that the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) on a point of order asked what arguments were hon. Members to confine themselves to, unless they discussed the merits of the Bill.

*Mr. SPEAKER said he was afraid he could not provide the hon. Member with arguments. If there were no arguments in favour of the recommittal of the Bill, the Amendment should not be moved.

*Mr. BARRIE said there was one further reason why this Bill should be recommitted, and that was that two Select Committees had already sat on this subject and they had differed—one reporting for, another against, and in addition there was a strong body of public opinion against its provisions. The Bill, moreover, would be prejudicial to those who were in favour of pure butter. No legitimate interest would suffer if the Bill were recommitted to a Select Committee.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY seconded the Motion. He considered that it would be most unfortunate if they allowed 24 per cent. of water in milk-blended butter, when only 16 per cent. was allowed in ordinary butter. Everybody knew that milk-blended butter was a faked article. The milk, generally skim milk, was forced through the butter—generally foreign butter—in order to increase its weight. He asked the hon. Baronet why it was that this adulterated and fraudulent article got a special treatment in this Bill? In his opinion its sale should be absolutely stopped in the public interest.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee."—(*Mr. Barrie.*)

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) thought the Government had taken a very serious step. Indeed if they passed the provisions in the Bill, it would be absolutely ruinous to a great Irish industry. The clause to which he took particular exception was that which provided that this fraudulent article might contain 24 per cent. of water, while pure butter and margarine were only allowed 16 per cent. of water. He knew, of course, that the hon. Baronet would say that this particular article would not be called butter when sold. But it would be called butter in hotels and all such places. Why did the Government do this? It was free trade gone mad. They invited foreigners from every part of the world to send into this country an article loaded with water. He invited the hon. Gentleman to drop this particular clause.

The TREASURER of the HOUSEHOLD (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) said it was perfectly clear that they could not discuss the merits of the Bill on a Motion for its recommittal. He under stood the object of the hon. Member for Londonderry, N. was that the Bill should be recommitted to another Select Committee; but he would remind the House that the Bill was founded strictly upon the recommendation of the Select Commission of last session.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Did the Select Committee recommend you to allow 24 per cent. of water?

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, unanimously. He urged the House not to agree to the recommittal, but to proceed to the work of considering the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said he wished hon. Members to realise that the recommittal of the Bill meant its destruction for this session. That was obvious. The Bill contained many most excellent provisions, and he suggested that the proper place to discuss the merits of milk-blended butter was on Clauses 4 and 8. If they could convince the House that these clauses were bad, they could be struck out.

*Sir FRANCIS LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston) thought the House ought not to be bound by the decision of any Committee. They were there to judge of all questions submitted to them for themselves and were quite competent to come to a decision upon them quite irrespective of the opinions which any Committee might have expressed in regard to them. He was not opposed to the Bill generally, and he would do his best to assist in passing it into law, but there was, nevertheless, this one fatal blot in it, namely, that this new substance known as milk-blended butter was to be allowed to have a greater percentage of water in it than ordinary butter or margarine. He could not see why that should be so. If the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill could give the House some assurance——

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is taking the cream off his future argument.

*Sir FRANCIS LOWE said he only intended to deal with milk and not with cream. He hoped the hon. Baronet would re-consider the point referred to as to milk-blended butter being allowed to have a greater percentage of water than ordinary butter or margarine.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 23; Noes, 233. (Division List No. 327.)

AYES.

Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bowles, G. Stewart
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Delany, William
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hills, J. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Parker,SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Hugh Barrie and Mr. O'Shaughnessy,

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.
Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,JosephA.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cavendish,Rt.Hon. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, HerbertJ.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar,SirJ.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford,S.)
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.

Hayden, John Patrick
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill. John Gordon Swift
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Starkey, John R.
Steadman, W, C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Bill, as amended, considered.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY moved a new clause to the effect that a name should not be approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries for use in connection with margarine or milk-blended butter if it referred to or was suggestive of butter or anything connected with the dairy interest. He said that in moving this Amendment he thought he was carrying out the wishes of the Committee, because he applied the words of limitation not only to margarine but to milk-blended butter. He therefore trusted that the new clause would be satisfactory not only to the House but to the members of the Committee.

New clause—

"A name shall not be approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries for use in connection with margarine or milk-blended butter if it refers to or is suggestive of butter or anything connected with the dairy interest."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he really did not see what this clause did, except to carry out what was already provided for in Clause 8. What it did was already provided for in the Bill, which would enact that no name which included the name of butter should be approved by the Board of Agriculture for butter substitutes. He did not see the use of these words, therefore, unless they were designed to throw dust in their eyes. There was no doubt that they were present at the death of a great industry in Ireland, and he asked for an explanation why the distinction between margarine and milk-blended butter was to be drawn? In reality the right hon. Gentleman was proposing that a fraudulent article might have 8 per cent. more of water than the genuine article, and he asked whether it was fair to the true butter interests that either margarine or milk-blended butter, which walked abroad naked and unashamed, should have a better position under this legislation than the genuine article. Milk-blended butter was made up of the rinsings of all the churns of Europe. He strongly objected to the introduction of margarine into the clause unless the hon. Baronet told him that the proposal was to leave the old name, margarine, alone. The clause, if it was to be of any value at all, should, in his view, be confined to milk-blended-butter. He thought they were entitled to know what name the English and Irish Departments had fixed upon for this new adulterant. Had the Irish Department made up their Hibernian mind as to the name of this misshapen child, and had the English Department made up their minds as to what it should be called? He thought they were entitled to know what the Government were going to call this illegitimate offspring of both Departments.

*Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.), as a member of the Committee, said he was no friend of the Bill. He did not think it was wanted, but he was astonished at the reception it had met with on coming down from the Grand Committee. He and other members had sat day after day upstairs to consider it, and he was surprised to find that the first Motion made by a gentleman who was a member of that Committee was one to recommit the Bill. Then his hon. friend the Member for North Louth, who was also a member of the Committee, came down and denounced the Bill.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he had never denounced the Bill. What he had said was that it was a good Bill *minus* this clause.

*Mr. BYLES said the hon. Member had denounced the article which this Bill set out to make legal, although it was a perfectly innocent and pure substitute for butter. Really he thought the proceedings somewhat surprising.

*Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was not addressing himself to the clause now before the Committee.

Mr. BYLES said that other speakers had alluded to the subject, and he thought he was justified in drawing attention to it. All he wished to point out was that 24 per cent. of moisture or water was not more fraudulent than 1 per cent. He was sure the hon. Member would not accuse him of any desire to destroy Irish industries, but he must point out that the Irish salt firkin butter had far more moisture than 24 per cent. He did not see the object of this clause, but, if the House added it to the Bill, he thought they ought to take out the words "milk-blended butter." They were, by the Bill, going to legalise the production and sale of an article which was milk-blended butter, and then it was proposed, by this clause, deliberately to enact that it should not be sold as milk-blended butter or under any name which suggested butter. He thought that was to stultify themselves.

*Sir FRANCIS LOWE said it was not often that he agreed with the hon. Baronet opposite, but he was glad to be able to agree with him on this occasion. The objection which he took on the Committee stage was taken not to Clause 8, but to Clause 7, which had nothing to do with milkblended butter, but had reference to the marking of wrappers in which margarine was to be sold. What he and others had contended was that the clause as it stood was badly drawn, incomprehensible, and insufficient to carry out the purpose for which it was intended, and one of the reasons why he had objected to it was that there was nothing contained in it to indicate the manner in which the Board of Agriculture should exercise the discretion which was given to them to approve a fancy name to be used in connection with the word "margarine" upon the wrappers, etc., in which it was enclosed. He had himself brought forward a new clause to substitute for Clause 7, and the hon. Baronet had agreed if this were withdrawn to bring forward a new clause of his own to remedy these defects on the Report Stage. The new clause now proposed, taken in conjunction with other Amendments on the Paper in respect to Clause 7 and standing in the name of the hon. Baronet, seemed on the whole sufficient to meet the objections which had been raised to the clause. Under these circumstances, although he preferred his own clause, he was prepared now to withdraw it in favour of that of the hon. Baronet.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.) pointed out that the sale of milk-blended butter was perfectly legal now without any restriction whatever, and was going on to-day to the great detriment of the butter trade.

MR. BARRIE said that might be the case, but the fact that it was milk-blended butter must be disclosed on the wrapper.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said it was true that it must be sold with a wrapper on which it was declared that the article was milk-blended, but this Bill placed further restrictions on its sale. In the future it must be distinctly separated from butter altogether, and it must not be sold under any name resembling it. Therefore, so far as the butter trade, who had complained that the sale of this article was a detriment to the butter industry, were concerned, the Bill was a help and not a hindrance. Was the House of Commons prepared to say that an article of food such as milk-blended butter was not to be sold at all? Were they going to tell the working people of this country that whether people wanted it or not milk-blended butter should not be supplied? It was in the interest of the butter trade to put a restriction on this article which came into competition with butter. Every one of the Nationalists on the Committee voted for this, and the only two Irish representatives who voted against it were the hon. Member for North Derry and the hon. Member for Mid Armagh. Clause 8 provided that this article should be sold under a distinct name, and in conformity with the undertaking given to the Committee the Government provided in this new clause that that name should in no way resemble butter.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Call it faked butter.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said this Bill placed a restriction on the sale of milk-blended butter. He would prohibit it altogether, because he thought the article was a fraud. Milk-blended butter was butter into which milk had been forced by a spiral machine in order to increase its weight and bulk. When people purchased margarine they knew what they were purchasing. When they bought this milk-blended butter they did not, and he would like that word struck out of the clause.

MR. FLYNN said it appeared to him there was a good deal of misconception upon this subject. At present the sale of milk-blended butter was legal. It was sold very largely all over the country, and the sale was increasing. It had been proved that the general public did not understand the question of these percentages, and the fact that milk-blended butter contained 45 per cent. of moisture conveyed nothing to their minds. If some restriction was not made the sale would go on. Surely the opinion of the Committee which had devoted two months to a close and laborious study of the question was worthy of some weight. The process was to buy good Colonial butter containing 9 or 10 per cent. of moisture, and then milk was pressed into it and was a source of enormous profit. The Committee after a long discussion came to the conclusion that in butter and margarine there should be 16 per cent. of moisture; that margarine should continue to be sold as margarine, which was a name not in any way suggestive of its being a dairy product. With regard to milk-blended butter they came to the compromise, which would practically kill the trade, that in that article the moisture should be limited to 24 per cent., and that if it was sold it should not be sold as a dairy product of any kind. This new clause which compelled the Department of Agriculture to take a certain course was an honest compromise which met the views of the public on this question, and if the clause was adopted there was no doubt that this trade would perish in a very short time.

*MR. BARRIE said the desire of the Government was that there should be a particular name for this article. He saw no necessity at all for a third article. There was already butter and margarine, but he recognised that if the Government insisted that the sale of milk-blended butter must be regulated, the important thing was that it should be known by one name only.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) said the question to which the House ought to address itself was whether this clause was likely to benefit agriculture or not. He agreed that it was intended to, but would it in fact benefit the ordinary butter-producer either in England or Ireland? No one denied that milk-blended butter was fraudulent butter. It was colonial butter into which separated or skim milk had been injected. If colonial butter was put upon the market and sold as colonial butter, it would, under this Bill, have to contain no more than 16 per cent. of moisture, and the objection to this fraudulent article was that it was allowed to contain 24 per cent. He thought the promise given to the Committee should be carried out and that this article should be given a name which in no way suggested that it was a dairy product. Would the Government consent to call it bastardine or cow-juice? He thought the hon. Baronet ought to be able to tell the House, after having considered the question for months, what name the Government intended this article should be sold under. People who went into a grocer's shop for it ought to be secured from deception, and the hon. Baronet ought to tell the House whether he had made up his mind what name he was going to give to this fraud.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY expressed the opinion that the matter required a little explanation as to whether the clause really carried out the understanding, having regard to the fact that owing to the way in which it was now put to the House it was separated entirely from Clause 8. So long as it was a proviso to Section (*d*) it no doubt carried out the understanding, but now it was separated and put into the Bill as a new clause it was very doubtful whether it did.

MR. STEWART (Greenock) said that both margarine and milk-blended butter were manufactured articles, and they were not fraudulent unless they were sold under a fraudulent name, and the name of margarine did not describe that article at all. Neither did the name of milk-blended butter describe this article, because, in the first place, it was only separated milk that was put back into the churn and not milk. It was only the residue after the butter-fats had been removed. He asked the hon. Baronet if the House carried the 16 per cent. instead of the 24 per cent., whether he, in the interests of the entire community, would include both these articles under the name of margarine.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said the whole question dealt with by this Amendment ought to be dealt with on a future clause of the Bill. As to the question of whether milk-blended butter should be called margarine, the answer was "No," because milk-blended butter was butter with an added percentage of moisture over 16 per cent. If that was reduced to 16 per cent. the effect would be that it would become butter, and under this clause it would be illogical for the Board of Agriculture to call it margarine. He appealed to the House to come to a decision upon the point as to whether the Board of Agriculture should devise a name.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said he thought that there might be some little difficulty in interpreting this clause owing to its phraseology as it at present stood, and suggested that instead of "in connection with" the hon. Baronet should insert the words "now known as," because the words were not quite so plain as the hon. Baronet seemed to think.

*MR. DELANY thought the House was entitled to ask the hon. Baronet what name he was going to give this article. He ought not to expect the House to give him a blank cheque in the matter. For himself he might say he was not satisfied. As one connected with the agricultural council since its inception he might say they were not against this Bill. They found there were divergent interests in the dairying business in these two countries, and unfortunately there was an unholy alliance between the hon. Baronet and the hon. Gentleman representing the Agricultural Department of Ireland.

LORD R. CECIL said the House was entitled to an answer with regard to what was a very serious matter, and he did not think that the Government appreciated the point intended to be raised. If they were to treat the words milk-blended butter in the same sense as margarine it meant that they were not to have a word in addition to the words milk-blended butter. They might have milk-blended butter but not a word in addition. But here they were not doing that; they were going to say, and were in fact saying that they would sell the article as milk-blended butter provided they did not use in addition to milk-blended some word which was suggestive of butter or other dairy produce. Surely that was not intended by the Government. They were using the same word and machinery for margarine and milk-blended butter, though they were two different things. In order to prevent any additional word being used for margarine and for milk-blended butter they wanted to prevent the use of any word excluding the use of milk-blended butter." In spite of the great authority of the Government draftsman he could not help thinking that some alteration was required. He believed that the Bill was much better drafted as it originally stood. If they wished to have a new clause let it deal with milk-blended butter alone.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. URE, Linlithgowshire) said he could not agree with the noble Lord. He thought that the words clearly expressed what was intended, Throughout the provision the word "margarine," was used, and in addition the words "milk-blended butter."

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE said it was distinctly understood in the Committee that the term "milk-blended butter" was never to be used as a description of this new butter-substitute, but that it was to be described by a fancy name to be approved by the Board of Agriculture which did not in any way suggest that the substance was butter or anything resembling butter. To use the term "milk-blended butter" would certainly suggest that it was butter.

MR. URE said that if they had a packet of milk-blended butter there might be added another name, but the Committee were anxious that whatever name was used it should not be suggestive of butter in any way. The clause provided that when the Board of Trade approved of a name which was suggested by the trade it should not approve of any name to be added except a name which was not milk-blended butter or a dairy produce.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said the Solicitor-General for Scotland had just given them the effect of the clause. He said that milk-blended butter, according to the intention of the Bill and of the Government was a butter substitute hitherto known as milk-blended butter, and it might be sold with the words milk-blended butter on the wrapper in which it was placed.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: No.

MR. BOWLES said he had certainly understood the Solicitor-General to say so. He only wanted to know whether that was the intention of the Government, and whether that was the interpretation which they attached to their own Bill; if not, what was the necessity for putting the word "margarine" into the proposed new clause at all? As he understood, the whole intention of the Bill was that milk-blended butter, having a certain amount of moisture in it, should not be presented for sale to the public under any name which would suggest butter. The theory was that it was a fraudulent substitute. Now came the Solicitor-General to tell them that it might be described by other names which were not suggestive of butter, though nevertheless it might be described among other things as milk-blended butter. ["No."] Could anyone representing the Government tell them what it was to be described as? If the substance was not to be described as milk-blended butter what on earth was the meaning of this new clause? The point went to the root of the Bill; it was perfectly ridiculous that there should be any doubt left on the matter, and he earnestly hoped that some hon. or right hon. Gentleman would give some reasonable account of the meaning and intention of the Government in regard to this fundamental point of the whole matter.

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) said the clause had been threshed out by the Committee upstairs, and members of that Committee would remember that what Clause 8 referred to was an agreement which they had come to in Committee to make sure that any purchaser buying what was now known as milk-blended butter would have indicated on the packet what he was buying.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Why was not the clause put in upstairs?

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL said the clause was put in upstairs for the reason he had just stated. This new clause was in substitution of the clause put in upstairs, because, as hon. Members well knew, a clause put in while the Committee was sitting was very often subject to the Minister in charge of the Bill bringing up words which had been prepared by the Government draftsman instead of the words put in by the Committee. He was perfectly content with the words proposed by the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill, after his having consulted with the law officers whom he had at his disposal, and he had no doubt, though he himself did not see much difference in the words on the Paper that, with the advice at his disposal, the clause proposed by the hon. Gentleman was better than the words put in upstairs. With regard to this clause submitted by the hon. Baronet he did not see why they should be so confused about its meaning. It appeared to him simple. The word "margarine" was put in to enable the Board of Agriculture to regulate its sale better than they were able to do at present, because the evidence which came to them last year on the Select Committee was that although margarine was being sold as margarine, yet in a very large number of cases it was sold without the word "margarine" appearing, save in very small print, while the word "churn" or "cream" or "butter" appeared in very large type. He understood that the word "margarine" was put into the clause to protect the purchaser when buying margarine or churn or butter-fat, or any of the fancy names which, although not to be prohibited, were not to be used as they were being used now, in a manner which might deceive the public into thinking they were buying something other than margarine. They had had some cases before them where the word "margarine" appeared on some flimsy sort of paper, on which it was with difficulty seen that the word "margarine" was on the packet at all. This clause was only to enable the Board of Agriculture to see that the purchaser, when buying margarine, although there might be a fancy name attached to it, would have it made quite clear to him that it was margarine. The clause did not do away with fancy names, because one maker of margarine might be entitled to a fancy name for it as a better margarine than that of another maker; but the Board of Agriculture said that, whatever the fancy name selected, it must be so used as to make quite clear it was margarine that was being bought. As to milk-blended butter, the whole object they had had in view upstairs was to see that there was no fraud perpetrated on the public. What they meant by this clause, and what he understood the hon. Baronet meant now, was that the purchaser, in buying what was now milk-blended butter, should have some name given to that article so that he and the public might know they were not buying pure dairy butter. Hon. Members had been asking the Minister in charge of the Bill to state the name. He did not understand that it was to be one name. [Cries of "That is worse."] It might make the matter worse for some hon. Members, but not for those who knew the facts. Anyone who wanted to sell that article to the public under this clause would have to go to the Board of Agriculture with the name which he wished attached to the article, and the name would have to be approved by the Board before he could put it on the packet. He would also have to register the name, while the article would have to be brought under trial by the Board of Agriculture's inspector. Surely that was a step in advance. It might not go so far as some hon. Members would like; still, it was a step in advance, seeing that the article was now sold freely on the market without any regulation whatever. He was not going to argue about the words of the Government draughtsman. He was content to leave them to him and the Minister in charge of the Bill. He thought there was some confusion in the minds of hon. Members as to the intention of the clause, and if he had been able to throw light on the matter he had attained his object in speaking.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said he thought the explanation which had been given altered the whole character of the clause. Personally, he understood the clause to mean that in future milk-blended butter was not to bear the name of milk-blended butter. Now they were told that it was to bear an additional name. If that were not so why had the words "in connection with" been inserted? Did that phrase mean "together with"? If so, there was no reason why this milk-blended butter should not continue to be sold. Almost all hon. Members on that side of the House were under the impression that the name of milk-blended butter would remain under the clause, whereas the intention of the Committee was that the name should disappear altogether.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said this clause made it quite clear that milk-blended butter would disappear and would cease to exist as a name except in the Act of Parliament. Once more he desired to assure the House that the name would never appear again if this clause was passed.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said that if that was the intention of the clause he did not think the draughtsman had been very successful. In this new clause milk-blended butter was taken as the alternative to margarine, and therefore it was intended that the expression "milk-blended butter should no longer be used; it should be clearly stated that it was not going to be used as an alternative to margarine. What did the words "in connection with" mean? He did not say what the Courts would decide in the matter, but the draughtsman must have meant something by them in order to justify the adoption of the title. At any rate as the clause now stood there was some ambiguity in it which ought to be removed.

*MR. LEIF JONES said he thought the hon. Baronet must admit that the clause had not been very happily worded to meet the purpose which the House had in view. What they all wanted was that margarine and milk-blended butter should not be sold under any name that would deceive the public. The word "margarine" might be used in future, but he understood that milk-blended butter could not be used. That being so the point of the noble Lord was perfectly sound, because the clause implied that this name might be used. They could easily get out of this difficulty by wording the clause to state exactly what was meant. He suggested that the clause should run "margarine and milk-blended butter shall not be offered for sale under any name that refers to or is suggestive of butter or anything connected with the dairy interest."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) suggested that the Government should consider favourably the proposition which had just been made by the hon. Member for the Appleby Division. The object of the clause was that the public should not be deceived and in the public interest it should be made perfectly clear that people knew exactly what they were buying. With regard to milk-blended butter he was not particularly interested, but a large section of his constituency were interested in the butter trade, and as far as he was concerned he would have opposed this Bill to the bitter end had he not received the most explicit assurance that the Irish salt butter trade would not be injuriously affected by the passage of this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

LORD R. CECIL suggested to add at the end of the clause the words "nor shall such a name be used as a description of or in connection with milk-blended butter."

MAJOR SEELY moved that the words "for use in connection with" should be omitted and in place thereof the words "as descriptive of the substances now known as" inserted. The advantage of that was that it would be much shorter than the words the noble Lord had suggested, and it would get rid of the words "in connection with." His suggestion would really make the matter perfectly plain and there could be no possible mistake. That would meet the view of the noble Lord, because milk-blended butter would disappear.

MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough) seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'for use in connection with,' and insert the words 'as descriptive of the substance now known as.'"—(*Major. Seely.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

SIR E. STRACHEY said it appeared to be the desire of the House that some alteration should be made in this clause. It was impossible to accept the words which had been suggested, because there was already in the Bill a description of what milk-blended butter was. If the hon. Member for the Abercromby division would withdraw his Amendment he would undertake that when the Bill went to another place an Amendment would be moved to insert the words "as descriptive of" after the word "or" in line 2 of the clause.

LORD R. CECIL said the Amendment proposed by the hon. and gallant Member would scarcely meet the case, because it would still leave margarine and milk-blended butter on the same footing. His own proposal was to separate the two, and deal with them by separate Amendments. He did not think the words suggested by the hon. Baronet were very satisfactory. He might be unduly attached to his own suggestion, but he thought that the words "milk-blended butter" should be taken out from the place where they now appeared in the clause, and that milk-blended butter should be dealt with by a separate Amendment at the end of the clause.

SIR E. STRACHEY said there was really no difference between the noble Lord and himself. He was quite willing to undertake after consultation with him to see that words were introduced when the Bill went to another place to carry out what he desired.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY expressed the hope that the Government would accept the words proposed by the noble Lord. They had been asked to leave this matter over for the present, but it should be remembered that this was the second time they had been asked to leave it over. When the Bill was in Committee they were asked to leave it over to the Report stage.

MAJOR SEELY asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill had given notice of an Amendment to omit the words "as milk-blended butter or" in the second line of Subsection 2 of Clause 8.

What was the object of omitting those words? He had already pointed out that the clause, as he understood it, practically meant that the Government might abolish altogether the word "margarine." [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] That was the construction which it might receive. In the eighth clause the words "name or names" were used, whereas the House was misled to-day by the use of the words "A name" in the new clause He would like to know if in future there was to be only one name for these fraudulent articles. He would like to know why the hon. Baronet had not in the new clause followed the words in Clause 8. Suppose that instead of calling it milk-blended butter, he for the moment called it "bosh." He understood from what was said by an hon. Gentleman below the gangway that any fraudulent faker of butter could use for his own speciality a particular name instead of the good old English word "butter." There might be 400 or 500 different names, and the public would not know what they were getting. The hon. Baronet had made the suggestion that words would be put in the clause when the Bill went to another place. This was a question for the people, and the Amendment ought to be made now. It was really very hard to know what the intentions of the Government were. If there was a difficulty in finding the proper phrase on the spur of the moment, let them agree that this clause should be recommitted on the Third Reading. It was really a serious matter. This was the third or fourth session in which Conservative and Liberal Governments had tried to deal with the question. It was most unfair in dealing with an article of such enormous importance for the hon. Baronet to propose that the duties of this House should be handed over to "another place."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD R. CECIL said the new clause with his Amendment added. would read as follows—

"A name shall not be approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries for use in connection with margarine if it refers to or is suggestive of butter or anything connected with the dairy interest nor shall such name be used as descriptive of, or in connection with, milk-blended butter."

He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'or milk-blended butter.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed new clause."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I have already intimated that the views of the noble Lord and myself are in agreement, and I at once accept that, subject to any alteration that may be necessary

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE said there would be considerable doubt as to the construction of the clause as proposed to be amended. The suggestion of the hon. Member for North Louth was far better. The two substances were entirely distinct, and the reason for the confusion which the House had got into was that an attempt had been to deal with them both in one clause.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause as amended, added to the Bill.

MR. BARRIE said he wished to move on Clause 1, line 13, to leave out "milk," and insert "water."

*MR. SPEAKER said that the House had just passed a clause that a name should not be approved of for use in connection with margarine or milk-blended butter if it referred to, or was suggestive of, butter or anything connected with the dairy interest. The Amendment which the hon. Member proposed would violate that clause.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY moved an Amendment to meet the case of an establishment with two sets of premises —the one a butter factory proper, and the other a creamery.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out the words 'other premises,' and to insert the words 'premises other than a butter factory.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. T. M. HEALY said he wanted to know why this consideration was given to a creamery. It seemed to him that a creamery was the very place of all others which required inspection.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries had power to send specially authorised inspectors to inspect creameries, as the premises were registered.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that under Clause 3 it was optional to inspect creameries, but in the case of butter factories the inspection seemed to be compulsory. Now that they were legalising milk-blended butter, he believed that fraudulent creameries would start up all over the country. Why should not a creamery be dealt with in the same way as a butter factory? Surely both were engaged in the manufacture of butter. It would be a case of butter factories and creameries saying to the public: "Codlin's your friend, and not Short; try our old creamery butter, and not the factory butter." Without casting any aspersion on the creameries of the past, why should creameries of the future have an advantage over the butter factories? Of course his view would be met at once if all the makers of butter and margarine whether in factories or in creameries were put upon the same footing. He would recall to the House the views of the Committee appointed by the Conservative Government, which consisted, among others, of Sir Horace Plunkett and the hon. Member for Devonport. That Committee of butter experts, eleven in number, reported in 1902 that in the course of their inquiry they had been informed that the incorporation of water with butter in order to increase its weight was at one time extensively practised in Hamburg and Holland, and in a modified form that practice was now in operation in this country; and a considerable quantity of material was blended with what was called milk, containing 24 or 25 per cent. of water. The Committee recommended the adoption of a limit of 16 per cent. of water in the preparation of butter and margarine. He admitted that the subject was a most difficult one, and that many interests had to be met; but he insisted that if they compelled butter factories to undergo inspection, creameries should be put on the same basis and level. The hon. Member for South Tyrone was now on his trial, because he had said on the previous day that he would stand up even against the Treasury, and squeeze all he could out of the Treasury. What they asked him to do was to squeeze this "bosh" butter, and take the water all out of it.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that creameries could be inspected if the Board of Agriculture suspected that any illegal process was being carried on in them. He strongly urged his hon. and learned friend not to press his argument too far, for if he read the evidence he would find that it was in the interests of Ireland, or of parts of Ireland, that these regulations were put in.

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE moved the adjournment of the debate. He said that they had now reached the most important part of the measure, the part dealing with the percentage of water to be allowed in milk-blended butter. They had been sitting from twelve o'clock to half past six, and he thought they should bring fresh minds to the consideration of what was really the gist of the whole opposition to the Bill.

MR. ASHLEY seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned."—(*Sir Francis Lowe.*)

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said he felt quite sure that the plea put forward by the hon. Gentleman who moved the Motion was not a sufficient justification for it. He therefore hoped that it would not be persisted in. The discussion on the Bill had proceeded harmoniously, and he was sure the general feeling of the House was in favour of going on. He was convinced that the consideration of the Bill should not now take more than an hour or two, although he hoped that it would take less.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that the discussion of the Bill would take less time if the representative of the Board of Agriculture would state his policy. The progress of the Bill depended upon the manner in which the Minister in charge met reasonable Amendments without wasting time. They had been hammering at him for two hours in regard to one Amendment which he said he could not accept, and at the conclusion of two hours he accepted the proposal of the noble Lord. Having done that now, he looked as if butter would not melt in his mouth. All margarine and bosh butter should, in his opinion, be put on the same footing. Why should a Liberal Government stand up for fraud and resist the proposal that margarine and bosh butter should be put on the same footing? There was no reason why the Bill should take any considerable time if the Minister in charge of it would meet them in the matter. He would point out that the House of Lords would be on their side, because the House of Lords were not in favour of bosh butter, and, so far as he knew, it was not a principle of the Conservative Party. The Minister in charge had the whole matter in his own hands, and all he had to do was to put margarine and bosh butter on an equal footing—16 per cent. of water for both.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) thought that they ought to have some indication of the name which the Board of Agriculture intended should be applied to this substance of milk-blended butter. He had come to the conclusion that "Milkerine" would not be a bad name for it. [AN HON. MEMBER: It should be "Waterine."] For his part so long as the Government were content to call it "Milkerine" he did not think anyone would care whether it contained 30, 40, 50, 60, or even 90 per cent. of water.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY suggested that the compound should be called "frauduline."

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was not entitled to discuss matters of that sort, as the only question before the House was the question of the adjournment of the debate.

LORD R. CECIL hoped the Government would accede to the Motion for the adjournment. It was not reasonable that they should ask them to sit after half-past six on a Friday evening, and also on Saturday and he supposed on the Sunday as well. For himself he had lost account of the Bills read out by the Prime Minister, and he did not think the Government was treating the House of Commons in a fair way.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) hoped that even if the Government did not accept this motion for the adjournment they would not after the conclusion of the proceedings of this Bill bring on any other work and set up a fresh Bill on a Friday afternoon.

MR. BOWLES wished to know how long the Government contemplated keeping the House sitting on a Friday evening with a Saturday sitting in view. If the Government were determined to keep them there hour after hour, and day after day, in view of the fact that the minority was a very small body but had a considerable amount of work cast upon them, it did not seem unreasonable to ask how long the Government intended to keep them in the House over this Butter and Margarine Bill. He understood they did not intend to accept the Motion for the adjournment, and under the circumstances he did not think it was too much to ask them to give some vague idea of the measures which they intended to discuss that evening.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 42; Noes, 174. (Division List No. 328.)

AYES.

Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gilhooly, James

Gretton, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Healy, Timothy Michael
Lambton, Hon. FrederickWm.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Murnaghan, George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker,SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, JohnFrederickPeel
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker,Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Francis Lowe and Mr. Ashley.

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(SussexE Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig,HerbertJ.(Tynemouth)
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner,Co.lAlan(Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Halsam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones. William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Marks,G. Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton. James Mellor
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzi
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Thompson,J.W.H(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L.(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, Nort)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE said the object of the Amendment he now proposed was to make the limit of 16 per cent. of water which applied under the Bill to butter and margarine apply also to this new and somewhat equivocal substance which was recognised for the first time under this Bill as milk-blended butter. He was utterly at a loss to understand why milk-blended butter should be allowed to have 24 per cent. of water in it, whilst butter and margarine should only be allowed to have 16 per cent. of water in them, or why the addition of 24 per cent. of water should be considered to be adulteration in the one case and not in the other. The addition of so much water to milk would certainly not be allowed, and the milk-seller who attempted to doctor his milk in that way would certainly be had up before the magistrates and fined heavily for his pains. The whole object of this Bill was to protect the people against fraud and to insure that every article purporting to be butter or any substance analogous to butter was in reality that which it was represented to be when it was sold. He could not conceive of anything that was more calculated to open the door to fraud and make easy the path to adulteration than a provision of this kind. It simply meant that a person who sold butter would be able to load up his butter with water to such an extent that it would weigh a great deal heavier, and although on the face of it it would appear to be a great deal cheaper than ordinary butter, the purchaser would in reality have to pay a good deal more for the actual butter it contained, because it would contain 50 per cent. more water than the genuine article. It was said that a considerable demand for this class of butter existed amongst the poorer classes, because it suited their purpose and was cheaper than ordinary butter. He did not know whether this demand really existed or not, but even if it did it ought not to be legitimised or encouraged, as these poor people were deluded into believing they were getting it at a lower price, whereas a great part of the price they were paying was for water and not for butter at all. Furthermore, he might point out that if any of their people desired to have an admixture of butter and water, it was open to them to buy a smaller quantity of butter and mix it with water for themselves. This Bill itself amounted to a deception and a fraud because throughout the whole of its clauses the term "milk-blended butter" was invariably applied to a substance which was not milk-blended butter at all but merely water-blended butter.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY, in seconding the Amendment, said he failed to see why this milk-blended butter should be allowed to have 24 per cent. of water and ordinary butter only 16 per cent. He would like to know what induced the hon. Baronet to agree to the figure of 24 per cent. of water as the standard for milk-blended butter, while for ordinary butter he only allowed 16 per cent. It was a monstrous thing that such a standard should be allowed, and if he had the power he would do away with milk-blended butter altogether, because he regarded it as a fraudulent article.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 13, after the word 'factory,' to insert the words 'or if any milk-blended butter, which, when prepared for sale or consignment, contains more than 16 per cent. of water, is on any premises registered under this Act.'"—(*Sir Francis Lowe.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that at last they had come to what had been constantly referred to as one of the greatest objections to the Bill. The House had now to decide whether they wished to prohibit milk-blended butter altogether or to restrict the sale of it. At the present moment the sale of milk-blended butter was perfectly legal. He was surprised, when he heard the hon. Member for North Louth denounce it in no unmeasured terms, that the Government had not had his help on the question of the sale of milk-blended butter during the last six or seven years. Now the hon. and learned Gentleman not only wished to prohibit its sale altogether, but also, as he had said "the old fraud, margarine." He could not help thinking that there were others who desired to prohibit the sale of milk-blended butter because it would help to prohibit the sale of "the old fraud, margarine." The whole question now was the prohibition or the restriction of the sale of milk-blended butter, because all would agree that its unrestricted sale was a fraud. The arguments put forward in favour of prohibition were, first of all, by grocers throughout the country, that the grocers did not desire to have a third article of this character in their shops. He ventured to think that that was not an argument which the Government ought to consider. They ought in the interests of the country to see that so long as they were properly protected the public should have a right to buy a cheap article suitable to their needs. The Mid. Rhondda Grocers' Association passed a resolution to the effect that to allow the extra 8 per cent. of moisture would be unfair to the retailer. But that again was not in the interests of the public, and if the Government saw that the public were properly protected and that they had the opportunity of buying butter and did not care for margarine, then he thought they should have an opportunity of buying milk-blended butter if they so desired. Then they were told that milk-blended butter was an article of no food value. It was admitted that separated and skim milk had not the same food value as whole milk and that would also apply to skim milk cheese, which was not of the same food value as a cheese made from whole milk or cream. But was it to be said that people who were not able to buy whole milk or cream cheese were to be prohibited from buying separated milk or skim cheese? What was the position that had to be taken up if the House agreed with the view he put forward, that so long as a man knew what he was buying, so long as the public were not deceived, they had a right to buy any article of food so long as it was wholesome and not so described as to deceive them? The position was this, that the public were buying milk-blended butter under the impression that it was another form of butter, and in some cases they believed they were buying something better than ordinary butter because this butter had been rechurned. The House now had to consider the two alternatives, prohibition or restriction and limitation of sale. What this Bill did was to decide that it was impossible to prohibit the sale of a wholesome commodity so long as people knew what they were buying. The Government had been fortified in that opinion because the Select Committee on the Butter Trade which sat for a considerable period and heard a great deal of evidence upon the question came to the conclusion that this milk-blended butter should only be allowed to be sold under another name to be approved by the Board of Trade. That recommendation was embodied in the Bill. That Committee came to the conclusion that it would not be right to recommend the prohibition of the sale of this article. Let there be no cant about this matter. When hon. Members wanted to reduce the moisture from 24 per cent. to 16 per cent. those who knew anything about it knew that that was prohibition, because when the moisture was reduced to 16 per cent. milk-blended butter became simple butter. The only difference between butter and milk-blended butter was that one had 16 per cent. and the other more than 16 per cent. of moisture. It was a mere question of moisture. The Standing Committee had taken the same view as that which had been taken by the Select Committee on the Butter Trade and had retained in the Bill the proviso restricting and limiting but not prohibiting the sale of this article. The Central Chamber of Agriculture discussed the question at their meeting in March or April, and after a long discussion decided by a small majority to retain the 24 per cent. of moisture as against the 16 per cent. The Central Chamber of Agriculture came to that conclusion, because as sensible men they knew they could not ask for protection in this way and that the 16 per cent. meant absolute prohibition. No doubt all agriculturists if they considered these matters only from the point of view of their own selfish interests would like to see both milk-blended butter and margarine prohibited, and it was satisfactory to find agriculturists insisting in the Central Chamber of Commerce that all they could do was to pass resolutions that milk-blended butter should be called by a name which had nothing to do with, and which would not be suggestive of butter. Not only did the Central Chamber of Agriculture pass resolutions approving the Bill, but the British Dairy Farmers' Association also a few months ago unanimously passed resolutions approving the Bill and expressing a hope that it would pass.

MR. ASHLEY: They wanted the Bill, but did not want this particular proviso.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he was president of the association and was present at the meeting of the council when the resolution was passed. He himself told them that if they opposed the resolution the Bill would go through with the 24 per cent. of moisture, and they then declared they would have the Bill as it was.

MR. ASHLEY: Naturally they would rather have this than nothing.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Not at all. He had great faith in the Dairy Farmers' Association, and if they had thought it was necessary not to have this Bill they would have said so. They saw that under the Bill they would derive great advantage. Then the question was brought before the Parliamentary Committee of the County Councils Association at the instance of the Cheshire County Council, who desired that association to object to milk-blended butter, and ask for prohibition by reducing the percentage of moisture to 16 per cent. The Parliamentary Committee replied that they were not in favour of the resolution of the Cheshire County Council, and that the reduction of moisture to 16 per cent. would be equivalent to prohibition. The Parliamentary Committee of the County Councils Association knew exactly what was meant by such a suggestion. The recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee came before the County Councils Association only a few days since, and the association unanimously accepted the Report of the Committee. The County Councils Association could not be said to be prejudiced in this matter except in so far as it was their duty to look after the public health. They considered that this substitute for butter could be sold under a name, which proved that they did not consider in the interest of the public health that there was anything wrong being done. They were quite clear on one thing, and that was that there ought to be no prohibition. What did it all come to? It came to this, that they asked that in future milk-blended butter, although it would be allowed to be sold, should no longer be sold as milk-blended butter or described by any name at all that had anything to do with butter; and, further, that it should only be sold in a wrapper, and only be described by a name on any wrapper or in any advertisement, which name must be approved by the Board of Agriculture; and the Board were not to approve of any name or description which suggested butter. It would be perfectly in the power of the Board of Agriculture to have a wrapper on which notice was given of the exact amount of water that was contained in the mixture. The Board of Agriculture would do their duty fully in the matter, and would see that the substance was described in such a way that the customer could not be deceived as to the article he was purchasing. In future this substance known as milk-blended butter would only be sold under some proprietary name approved by the Board of Agriculture. He hoped that the House would be satisfied with what the Bill proposed. It would do justice between the two interests, and the working classes of the country would not be deprived of the food they desired. If they were unable to pay for an article so expensive as butter they would, at the same time, be absolutely protected by the fact that milk-blended butter could only be sold under a name which had nothing to do with butter.

*MR. DUCKWORTH (Stockport) said he was sure that the House would congratulate the hon. Gentleman on the ability with which he had spoken on the case. He was not in opposition to the Bill as a whole. He was in favour of the Bill with the exception of this one clause. He would be very sorry personally, and he knew that those for whom he spoke would also be very sorry, if the Bill were dropped. But he was very strongly opposed to any favour being given to what was known now as milk-blended butter, and especially that it should have an advantage over margarine and butter. He spoke with an experience of nearly forty years in the butter trade. The firm to which he belonged had in the North of England nearly 100 branches, where butter was sold day by day. But he had behind him also the whole of the trade of the North of England, both wholesale and retail. There was hardly a single association connected with the trade that was not in favour of this article being brought on to a level with margarine and genuine butter. He presided at an enthusiastic meeting on Tuesday last at Manchester on the question. There were delegates attending that meeting from the port of Hull, Glasgow, and many other places in the North of England, and the following resolution was unanimously and enthusiastically passed—

> "That this meeting is thoroughly of opinion —Firstly, that milk-blended butter, under whatever name it may be called, should not contain more moisture than either butter or margarine. Secondly, that the introduction of this article, containing as it does 50 per cent. additional moisture, will be harmful to the producing and distributing interests, and is really, more or less, a deception on the consuming public. Thirdly, that as Acts of Parliament already prohibit the addition of more than a certain percentage of butter fat to margarine, the wilful addition of water to butter should also be prohibited."

He had received a letter that morning stating that the Co-operative Wholesale Society in Manchester, representing 1,200 co-operative societies, were in agreement with the resolution. But it was said that traders were afraid of competition. That had been said in Committee and had been said also in the discussion that day. Nothing could be further from the truth than a statement of that kind. If the country were flooded with this faked article, as it would be if 8 per cent. additional moisture were allowed, the trade would have to handle it, and they all knew that the profit on a substitute was greater than on the genuine article. So that they had nothing to fear from an article of that kind. Their opposition was based on the certainty that the sale of this stuff would lend itself to fraud, and the victims would be largely the poor and ignorant. It was all very well for hon. Members to say glibly that people knew what they were buying, and why should they prohibit it. But the people did not know what they were buying, especially when those they were dealing with were trying to deceive them. The promoters of the Bill said: "Oh, we will give it a name that will kill it." His reply to that was: "Why create a thing in order to kill it?" They would not kill it. If it was made the colour and shape of butter they might call it "Butterine" or "Waterine" or anything else; the people would buy it, and thousands would buy it for genuine butter. He was amazed at the persistency with which this Bill was being pushed. There was something behind it that did not appear on the surface. It had been publicly stated that if this part of the Bill passed, and it became legal to add 24 per cent. moisture to this article, a huge trust would be formed with any amount of capital behind it, and the thing would be pushed to the exclusion of all other kinds of butter or margarine throughout the length and breadth of the country. Only those who were familiar with the trade knew in what numerous ways an article like this might be pushed. Names might be given to it, if they allowed the use of names, and it might be put in different shapes in order to deceive the public. He would like to ask the noble Lord the President of the Board of Agriculture and the hon. Baronet who represented him in that House how they liked the contemplation of such a possibility. How would their friends the farmers, who liked to sell a genuine butter and get a fair price for it, fare under these circumstances? It was said that it was only a small matter. But he thought it would be found to be a very vital matter to the farmers of the country if the market were flooded with this butter substitute. He was sure that the promoters of the Bill did not want to encourage the clever fellow who could make water stand on end and sell it at 10d. or 1s. a pound. But that was what they were doing. Forty to 50 per cent. of moisture, he was told, had been found in this faked article; yet they said it was legal. Fines had been inflicted, but like the street bookmaker they paid the fines, smiled, and went on selling the stuff. They could easily do that because of the enormous profit they were making. But they were about to say to these defrauders of the public: "You shall not be allowed to put 40 or 50 per cent. of water in this article, but we will allow you 24 per cent.," which was 8 per cent. more than was allowed in margarine or genuine butter. That was a curious method of giving preference. By law they already prevented makers of margarine from putting more than 10 per cent. of butter in the manufacture of that article, professedly to prevent its being sold as butter; but here they were going to allow an extra 8 per cent. of water, instead of 40 or 50 per cent., in the hope that it would not be sold as butter. To borrow an illustration from one of the speakers on Tuesday—the Government might just as well strike off a number of gold coins exactly like a sovereign, but worth only 18s. each, and expect that no one would pass them as real sovereigns. They were told that milk-blended butter was a cheap and harmless article of food, and that on free trade principles they had no right to prevent its being sold. He had a letter which rendered this very clearly, and knocked the bottom out of the argument altogether. He denied that it was cheap or harmless. The added water made the article dear. Poor people, to whom it was sold in the greatest quantities, did not reckon so much per cent.; they knew nothing about that, and therefore they were deceived. It took the place of butter fats, and it was a fraud on the purchaser. He could give the House an example of the effect this proposal would have upon Lancashire operatives. They took their breakfast largely from bread and butter which was prepared either the night before or at 5.30 in the morning, and it was taken to the mill in a handkerchief or tin and had to be kept several hours in a room in which the atmosphere varied between 80° and 90° Fahrenheit. By supplying them with an article containing so much moisture they were being deceived and were not getting a proper amount of nourishment from it. They heard a great deal about physical degeneration, but this was one of the things which was increasing that danger. They were told on the Committee that they had no right to interfere with the food of the people, but he was strongly opposed to any advantage being given to milk blended butter over margarine and genuine butter. He was sure the Government did not really wish to encourage fraud in the sale of this or any other article of food.

*MR. A. H. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne) said it was not inappropriate that one grocer should follow another in the debate, but he wished to state clearly that in this matter, unlike the Member for Stockport, he held no brief for the trade. Those who knew the severe competition that existed in regard to this particular article would understand why the grocers' associations in various parts of the country were up in arms against milk-blended butter. He remembered the time when the grocers were quite as antagonistic to margarine as they were now to milk-blended butter, but all that opposition had disappeared now because margarine had become a more profitable article over the grocers' counter than pure butter. He believed there were still some grocers who never sold an ounce of margarine and might reasonably advocate the doing away with it altogether. Those who had watched the rapid growth in the sale of milk-blended butter would see at once the reason why there was a prejudice against it. He cross-examined every man who gave evidence on this point before the Committee with the direct object of getting some admission that milk-blended butter was an unwholesome article, and he failed to get any such admission. Other hon. Members also failed in this respect, and there was nothing in the big book of evidence which had been published to the effect that it was an unwholesome article. The only evidence on this point was that if they took milk-blended butter into the hot factory or put it into the oven it would not keep fresh so long as Danish or Irish butter. He contended that at the present time nine-tenths of the milk-blended butter sold was sold fraudulently. People who bought milk-blended butter believed that it was made from the milk without any separation taking place, and they thought it was a better article than the ordinary butter. There was evidence to show that the public appreciated this article. What was the position? There was evidence that the public demanded this article, but there was no evidence that it was an unwholesome article. Were they going to say, "We do not care what may be the weight of evidence; it is disagreeable to the grocers, and for that reason we are not going to allow the public to demand it"? He contended that there was a question of free trade involved. [Voices, "Oh, no."] To stop an article being sold which was not unwholesome and for which there was a public demand was surely a violation of free trade doctrine. He contended that the opposition which had been aroused on this question was needless. If under the Bill milk-blended butter was called by a name which was not associated with butter and had no connection with butter they could rest assured that not only would its sale cease to increase but it would result in eventually stopping the sale altogether of milk-blended butter.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked if the Board of Agriculture intended that the wrappers in which this stuff was sold should give notice to the public of the amount of water in the mixture.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY indicated assent.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he had done his best to help Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes and Mr. Hanbury, but the hon. Baronet was the first person who had ever put milk-blended butter into a Bill. He was the first person who had linked the name of the Liberal Party with fraud. And if he wanted a name for this, instead of "Perfecto" he would suggest "Liberalismo." Mr. Hanbury proposed 20 per cent. in 1903, and the House came to the conclusion that the proposal would open the door rather too much for fraud. Accordingly, Mr. Hanbury's Bill was objected to and stopped. Mr. Fellowes brought in another Bill in 1904 to the same effect. Until the hon. Baronet introduced the phrase "milk-blended butter" into this Bill, nobody had ever heard of this monstrosity before. For what purpose did he introduce it? The hon. Baronet said it was for the purpose of extirpating it, although milk-blended butter had never been heard of before.

Mr. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) said the term "milk-blended butter" had been used for many years.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said he was speaking ing of Statutes and Bills. He knew that the phrase existed before, but it had not received statutory recognition. The hon. Member for Stockport in his able speech had pointed out that when they were dealing with margarine, they were dealing with a manufactured product. It was simply made of butter fats. The fats were genuine, and the fraud in margarine was the endeavour to pass it off for butter; but in the case of milk-blended butter a genuine article of admitted value was taken, and there was added water, and then it was said they had made a new and special article. It was a thing similar to that for which coiners were convicted at the Old Bailey. If he took a sovereign and added 10 per cent. of pewter to it, did it not look as well? Could he not palm it off as well? What crime had he committed? Only robbed the King. It was a crime to rob the King, but they might rob poor people. Let him deal now with the fraudulent phrase "milk-blended," because certainly the adoption of that phrase by the hon. Baronet gave him special distinction. It was not "milk-blended butter." They were dealing with water-blended butter — aquatic butter. Who knew whether any milk was added to the butter? 24 per cent., or nearly a quarter of it, might be water in future. Why not call it water-blended butter? Why should it be dignified with the name of milk? There was, in his opinion, something behind the advocacy and the extraordinary tenacity with which the phrase had been adhered to by the hon. Baronet. It was said that this was free trade. If that was so, then all he could say was, "God help free trade." He was neither a free-trader nor a protectionist; he was an Irishman. He would always fight for what was good for his country, and against that which injured her, no matter under what label it might be described. A fourth of the butter which was to be sold to the people as pure butter was only *aqua pura*. For aught that he knew the people of this country might have this imposed on them as pure butter. It was extraordinary that when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire asked the hon. Baronet to give a pledge that the amount of water should be placed upon the label all that he got in reply was a nod. Nods did not appear in *Hansard*.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think the hon. Baronet distinctly said "Yes." across the Table. There ought to be no mistake about it.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I think I nodded assent. Clause 8 says—

> " . . . there shall, in addition to the approved name, be printed on the wrapper in such manner as the Board approve, such description of the article as may be approved by the Board."

MR. T. M. HEALY said Jove nodded to some purpose, but it appeared to him that the hon. Baronet's nod meant nothing, because while he conveyed to the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire that the amount of moisture would be stated on the wrapper, it now appeared that all that was required was that a description of the article should appear on the wrapper. If it was an honest article why should the Government be ashamed of it? If it was to be baptised in pure water, why should they not declare the amount of the "fontage" that appeared on the label? The hon. Baronet was alone in his preference for water, for teetotal butter. If 24 per cent. was an admirable thing for the food of the people, why should not 48 per cent. be good for them? Why was the man who added 24 per cent. of water to butter to be considered a religious man, and the man who added 25 per cent. a sanctimonious impostor? If he were to give a description of the hon. Baronet or of any of the Rosebery Party that had found their way into the Government, he would say that it was "'24 per cent. of added water to Liberalism." But the House had arrived at the time when it was entitled to hear from a serious representative of the Government what was its position as to this question. The House had been kept sitting by their minor underlings, by men who had never enjoyed any weight, authority, or confidence in the House. At all events, he was entitled to say that, as to an enormous trade which the Irish people had with this country, a fraudulent article was for the first time to be palmed off on the consumers. They were told that this substance would do nobody any harm. He quite believed that there was nothing harmful in taking water with butter, but that was not the point. The point was whether a man who sold butter was injured by another who competed with him by selling an article of which a quarter was fraudulent. Though milk blended butter did not harm a man's stomach, did the sale of it not open the way for fraud? If in a poor district a little child was sent out with 1s. to buy three-quarters of a pound of butter, might not this other article be supplied unless adequate methods were adopted to protect the public against fraud? The man behind the counter might deliver the "bosh" butter to a child, who had been sent by its parents to buy a pound of butter, and the child might put the difference of a few pence in the price of "bosh" butter and pure butter in its pocket. This was a proposal which came before the House without weight or authority. Sir Horace Plunkett had no doubt been attacked, but at all events nobody denied that he had the interest of Ireland at heart, and he signed the Report against the proposal in this Bill. The hon. Member for Devonport, who knew something of what he was talking about, and was now Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, also signed the Report, and his opinion was more worthy of the attention of the House than that of the hon. Baronet. Undoubtedly this was a grave and serious business. Margarine was now sold under an honest name. Men in Belgium and Germany—and he noticed that every fraud came from Germany—sent over here this "bosh" butter, and for the first time, Parliament, under the Liberal Government, was going to sanction a proposal to add 24 per cent. of water. He maintained that there was something unusual and remarkable in that, and no reason could be given for it in the attitude of the hon. Baronet. He could see nothing in the hon. Baronet's position in the House which entitled him to say that he had any authority behind this proposal, beyond that of the hon. Baronet himself.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked the indulgence of the House to make an explanation. He had put a question to the hon. Baronet as to whether the Board of Agriculture would insist that it should be stated on the wrapper that this mixture contained 24 per cent. of water. He had received an affirmative nod. Thereupon he said: "I may take it that that is so," and then sat down without making any other observation. But the hon. Baronet's interpretation of the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Louth had created considerable doubt in his mind as to what the meaning of that nod was. Might he put the question again and ask for a specific and favourable answer to it? Would the Department of Agriculture ensure that under Clause 8 the wrappers there spoken of would mention the fact that this mixture contained 24 per cent. of water?

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY said he certainly meant that. He should not object to its being put in the Bill if it would improve it, but there was great difficulty in doing that. It might be done in another place.

Major SEELY said that if the hon. Baronet pledged himself on that point they had won their battle. Although they warmly applauded the efforts of the hon. Baronet to limit the trade in milk-blended butter, they suggested that he should go a step further and prohibit it altogether. It was ridiculous to contend that poor people were going to be robbed of a cheap butter. It was a fraud to sell butter and water as butter, and to charge for butter. The blend was made with very thin skim milk, which had passed through a collander, and of course the article was a fraud. If the hon. Baronet wanted a name for this mixture, which was made with the aid of the parish pump, he would suggest that it should be labelled, "Pumpine," and the statement added that it contained 24 per cent. of water. If that was done, nobody would buy it.

*Mr ASHLEY said that the hon. Member for Louth had drawn attention to the Report of the Select Committee signed by Sir Horace Plunkett and the Member for Devonport and other experts, but he wished to direct the attention of the House to the draft Report of the Chairman of the Butter Committee, the hon. Baronet in charge of this Bill, which sat last year. In that Report it was stated that, having regard to the price of milk-blended butter and the amount of water it contained, it was not a cheap article of food. Further, the Report went on to state that one trader had refused to sell milk-blended butter as he looked upon it as a fraudulent article, and that the introduction of that article into this country had had a demoralising effect upon the trade. The Report went on to say that if the sale of this article became general it would entail much inspection, and that it would have a prejudicial effect upon the public health. Therefore, he recommended that, in any legislation affecting the amount of water to be permitted in butter, no special exemption should be made in favour of milk-blended butter.

Mr. S. T. EVANS hoped the hon. Baronet would relent from the strong position which he had taken up. The hon. Baronet had not given any reason why he had changed the opinion he expressed last year. He had never heard the hon. Baronet speak with such force as he had done that day, and he could not understand why he had thrown so much spirit and eloquence into his speech. It was not enough to say that the article was of a very wholesome character; they had no right to sell it as butter when only one-half of it was butter and the other half water, and to charge the poor people for a pound of butter. The hon. Baronet had said that Clause 8 dealt with this matter. It did nothing of the kind. Again, the hon. Baronet had said that it was impossible to deal with this question now, and that it might be dealt with by the House of Lords. They did not want it to be dealt with by the House of Lords. He warned the hon. Baronet that he and his Government would be beaten unless it was stated clearly on the wrapper what the article really consisted of.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he agreed.

MR. S. T. EVANS said that the hon. Baronet seemed to be relenting. It should be clearly stated on the wrapper, not "such description of the article as may be approved by the Board," but some such words as these, "true definition of the article and of its ingredients." They should tell the common people how much milk and how much water was contained in the article, and unless some such words were inserted in the clause he should vote against it.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said that it was plain that there was some misapprehension as to the effect of the clauses relating to the definition of milk-blended butter. It was, therefore, necessary that this part should be made so clear as to prevent that misapprehension. He would deal with the way in which three edible compounds were now sold. There was butter, which could be bought at from 1s. to 1s. 6d. a pound. That was pure butter and was allowed to contain from 10 to 16 per cent. of water. Milk-blended butter sold for from 10d. to 1s. a pound and it contained 20 per cent. to 40 per cent., or it might be even 60 per cent. of milk or water. That was a state of things which no House of Commons could tolerate, and the object of this Bill was to prevent the fraud which so much moisture involved. In the artificial product, margarine, the same quantity of moisture was involved as in butter.

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE: You are legalising adulteration.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said he never believed that adulteration was a legitimate form of competition. Butter could not legally be sold with more than 16 per cent. of moisture; margarine could not be legally sold with more than 16 per cent. of moisture; but at this moment milk-blended butter, which was a wholesome product, if undesirable, contained 30, 40, or 50 per cent. of moisture. The object of the Bill was to prevent that fraud being perpetrated, to prevent so much moisture, and to protect the poor people who consumed this article and who wished for a cheap and wholesome substitute for butter. The grocers, the Chambers of Commerce, and the poor people would like butter if they could get it, or they would prefer margarine, but some classes of the people were inclined to buy milk-blended butter because it suited their pockets, however it affected their tastes. The Government were seeking to give the necessary protection, but it was obvious from the speeches of the hon. Member for North Louth and his hon. friend below the gangway, that some more protection should be given with regard to this milk-blended butter. Nobody had suggested, however, that it should be abolished, but everyone had agreed that some explanatory words should be applied in the Bill and the Government suggested certain words. They thought their words were better than those of the hon. Gentleman who spoke last, as they had had a little more time in which to consider them. Clause 8 was the one which was descriptive of milk-blended butter and regulated its sale, and the Government proposed to introduce into it words which, while providing that it should be dealt with under such name or names as was or were laid down by the Board of Agriculture, as in the case of margarine, the article should be delivered to the purchaser in a wrapper which in addition to the approved name and description of the article "shall set out the percentage of moisture contained therein." Those were the words they suggested. They thought "moisture" was better than "water."

MR. T. M. HEALY said "water" was better than "moisture." If the right hon. Gentleman would make it water he would drop his opposition to the Bill.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said they all wanted the same thing and the only difficulty was how to do it. The reason why the word "moisture" was adopted was that if one injected milk into butter it was not water; it was milk. If it would suit the hon. Member for North Louth they might insert both words "moisture" and "water" and then he thought all parties would be satisfied.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he would take that.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said that with that concession, if the hon. Member was pleased to call it one, he thought this controversy might cease.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he would accept that, and would now say good-night. [The hon. Member then left the House.]

SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) asked the President of the Local Government Board how he reconciled the logic of his hon. friend with his own proposed clause. They were enacting a 16 per cent. standard for margarine and a 16 per cent. standard for pure butter, but if the Government accepted the contention of his hon. friend, and if he was right to apply a different percentage to milk-blended butter, was not that to undercut the whole basis upon which this legislation as to pure butter and margarine had been worked? If they applied this principle of excusing the presence of an adulterant in a particular article, why should it not be applied in the case of the product of the honest farmer and of the manufacturer of margarine? There was, he submitted, no answer to that contention. It was a *reductio ad absurdum.* He thought the Government had taken a very wrong step in yielding to the representations of the trade, and they seemed to have acted upon some mistaken idea of the principles of free trade which they apparently thought consisted in allowing a man to buy what he liked. That was not free trade. The process which was used to bring about the product of milk-blended butter was used to disguise rancid butter and then it was sold to the poorest class of people. It seemed a monstrous thing that they should have a Liberal Ministry and a Minister of light and leading giving effect to such a policy of fraud.

MR. SEDDON said he was exceedingly sorry that the hon. Member for North Louth had withdrawn his opposition. If the amount of moisture in butter and margarine was 16 per cent. there was no reason why they should in this product of milk-blended butter give a margin of 24 per cent. He spoke with some knowledge of the grocery trade, as he spent sixteen years behind the counter, and his experience was that the honest trader was always the victim of the dishonest trader. While one sold butter the other sold margarine. The last Act was a protection to the honest trader and to the consumer. Then a production other than margarine was brought in. It was known as "mixture" and the public again were defrauded. The poor people, roughly speaking, were divided into two classes. There were the extremely poor, whose purchasing power was always regulated by their pocket, and they bought margarine because it was impossible to buy butter. But there was another class of the poor who had more delicate tastes, and they would buy a smaller quantity in order to get pure butter. That class required protection, and it was in the poorer districts that traders were enabled to use these milk-blended butters. He did not agree that what was on the wrapper should be the only notice, as it would only give power to tradesmen with money to advertise fancy names. They might, for instance, advertise "So and so's Fraudulene." Anyone who knew the grocery trade knew that the poor people did not buy their butter in pounds and half pounds, but in ounces and two ounces. He did not know what this mixture should be called, perhaps Tatcho. The provisions would give fradulent people a means of evading the law, because the article would be adulterated to the extent of 24 instead of 16 per cent. The Government were in fact going to see that a fraudulent substitute for butter was authorised.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said it seemed to him that a great deal of bother was being made about a very small matter. The issue was whether there should be two kinds of butter, one containing more moisture than the other. The hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill said he had a great objection to stopping it. What was the objection? The hon. Baronet said there was a trade for this milk-blended butter; that there was a demand for it; and therefore it ought to be allowed to go on. But the trade had arisen because they had allowed 30 and 40 per cent. of moisture to be added. No sooner had the hon. Baronet put on a limit than the trade would disappear. The objection of the hon. Baronet to do away with this trade had, therefore, no ground whatever. But there was another objection, which was that the public liked to buy this thing and, that being so, the House was asked why they should not be allowed to buy it. He did not see what good they did by allowing the public to buy butter which contained 8 per cent. more water than ordinary butter. Margarine was a different matter. No doubt it was a very good thing to grease bread with, but it was not butter. The hon. Baronet said that if the percentage of moisture was reduced to 16 per cent. this article would become butter. Then let it become butter. He also said that directly the moisture was limited to that which butter contained this trade would cease. Then let it cease. All this terminology and choice of terms was a mere waste of time and there was no good in it. It was said that if the limit was reduced to 16 per cent. it would protect the butter industry. It was a curious thing that the House could not discuss anything now without the old bogey of free trade coming in; it was like King Charles' head. A certain percentage of moisture was good for butter. If that was 16 per cent, why have another butter of 24 per cent.? The working classes did not want to buy butter with 8 per cent. more water in it than ordinary butter. As representing a working class constituency he said they did not want this water-blended butter; therefore let the House tackle the thing boldly at once by saying that they would not have it in any shape or form.

*MR. BARRIE said he had hoped that even at the eleventh hour the legalising of a third article would have been dropped. The proposal of the hon. Baronet had met with no sympathy from any portion of the House. This proposal was entirely owing to two or three wealthy firms who had been able by vigorous lobbying during the last few months to get a certain amount of support for an article that was frandulent. Every agriculturist in the district which he represented protested against this privilege being given to an inferior article. He urged upon the House the fact that it was proved before the Committee that there was no legitimate demand for this article, and that its consumption was only 2½ per cent. as compared with that of butter altogether apart from margarine. No part of the community would suffer if this new article was made to conform to the 16 per cent. standard. On the contrary it would only ensure necessary precautions against a few ingenious manufacturers who had succeeded in amassing large fortunes at the cost of the public, by pushing this article off on the average consumer, who was least able to protect himself. All the heads of the Agricultural Departments had spoken strongly against the legalisation of this article. They had been reminded that afternoon that the agriculturists were practically unanimous against it, and the late chief of the English Agricultural Department, the late Mr, Hanbury, carried the Committee over which he presided unanimously with him against giving facilities for the sale of this article. They must, therefore, assume that those responsible for the butter industry of the country were absolutely undivided in their opinion that this faked article should not be placed in the hands of the people. He therefore asked the House to vote in favour of the Amendment to make the standard 16 per cent. He was aware that he was asking them to give the death blow to this article by so doing, but they would not do justice to the consumer if they did not do so.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said the hon. Member had suggested that this was the result of the operations of some great syndicate outside, but the hon. Member must have overlooked the fact that there was a Committee which sat last year, and went into this matter, and that Committee had actually recommended the provision which was in the Bill. The names of the Committee who made that recommendation were the hon. Member for Rye——

MR. ASHLEY: He does not agree with the 24 per cent.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he understood that the decision was arrived at unanimously. Another Member of the Committee was the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, who took a leading part in fighting this matter, and there were two or three Members of the Irish Nationalist Party, and the result was a unanimous report of the Committee who had heard the evidence on the question. He agreed with the hon. Member for Bolton that the only thing the public wanted to know was what they were buying. If they wanted to buy water in the butter, so long as there was a percentage of water fixed they were entitled to know what that percentage was. He also agreed that once these facts were substantiated as to the percentage of water the public were buying and the limitation of the percentage of water fixed by the Bill, it would be hardly worth while to continue to manufacture. But so long as the public knew what they were buying that was all that was required. The Government were carrying out impartially the recommendations of the Committee which represented all interests and heard all the evidence. He trusted the House would now see its way to come to a decision. The question had been well thrashed out. If the Amendment was carried he must point out that the Government could not proceed with the Bill for the simple reason that the clause represented a very fair compromise which had been arrived at and accepted by the farmers and the Chambers of Agriculture. The Chambers of Agriculture representing the farmers of the country had accepted the Bill as a compromise, and if the Amendment was carried the hon. Member opposite who moved it would have to take the responsibility for it. This was the third attempt that had been made to deal with the problem. Unionist Governments had twice attempted to deal with it, and owing to the difficulty of adjusting conflicting interests their attempts broke down. This was a Bill that had been accepted by the Committee, and if hon. Gentlemen opposite were prepared to destroy the Bill it must be clearly understood that the responsibility rested with hon. Members and not with the Government. The Government would oppose the Amendment in order to save the Bill. He hoped the House would now come to a decision.

MR. FLAVIN said he fully recognised the compromise that had been made, but he would have much preferred it if the Government had placed milk-blended butter on the same footing as margarine, because milk-blended butter was a strong competitor of Irish butter. He also admitted that it was sold to-day with an unlimited amount of water in it. He did not say the Government had gone as far as they could, but they certainly had taken a step in the right direction to bring the dishonesty of the trade under control. That being so, he suggested as a compromise that the Government should reduce the percentage from 24 to 20 per cent.; that would be a step in the right direction.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.) said he could not understand the attitude of his hon. friend who said there was a compromise. Who were the parties to the compromise? As a representative of an agricultural constituency he was strongly in favour of the Amendment and absolutely against any compromise which would perpetuate a fraud on the poorest of the poor. A deputation from the South of Ireland waited on the hon. Baronet who was responsible for the Bill, and that deputation distinctly told the hon. Baronet that they would rather the Bill was lost than that this fraud should be perpetuated. He should vote for the Amendment because milk-blended butter was a fraud upon the poor, who thought they were getting good butter when, as a matter of fact, they were getting a mixture containing 24 per cent. of water.

MR. THOMPSON (Somersetshire, E.) said that he had received a communication from a body of agricultural councils in the district from which he came, saying they could not support the Bill as it stood and asking him to vote against it.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) asked whether, if the Government conceded the 16 per cent. limit on this butter, hon. Members opposite representing Ireland would support a Motion for placing Irish firkin butter on the same footing. Irish firkin butter at the present time contained more than 16 per cent. of moisture, and therefore if Hon. Members opposite voted for limiting the percentage of moisture in milk-blended butter to 16 per cent. they must also support a Motion that Irish firkin butter should contain no more. The hon. Baronet had made a great concession and had said that every packet must have marked upon it the fact that the article contained 24 per cent of water, that it was not sold as butter, and that if it was sold under a name which was not associated in any way with butter there could not be any fraud in it. He pointed out that a great deal of process or renovated butter was imported into this country from America. The butter was usually lacking in colour and flavour, and under American law had to bear the mark of renovated butter. That mark was removed directly the butter came into the United Kingdom, and the butter known as milk-blended butter was the same article with its mark taken off. Unless this Bill was accepted that thing would be allowed to continue. The Bill regulated the sale and allowed an article with a limited percentage of water to be placed upon the market.

MR. SEDDON asked whether he was to understand that any quantity, whether it was an ounce or a pound, would have a wrapper upon it giving all the information?

*MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes.

MR. BOWLES said he did not see that in the Bill.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said the words were in Clause 8, which stated that a butter substitute shall be dealt with under the conditions applicable to the sale of margarine—

> "With this modification that in any case where, in order to comply with those conditions, the article is delivered to the purchaser in a wrapper, there shall, in addition to the approved name, be printed on the wrapper in such manner as the Board approve, such description of the article as may be approved by the Board."

MR. BOWLES said that only applied to cases where the article was delivered in a wrapper, but what about the cases where it was not necessary to put it into a wrapper. This article would be sold by the ounce and in very small quantities, by the pennyworth and so forth, and in order to comply with the conditions of the Bill it was not in the least necessary, where a small quantity was asked for, to give a wrapper at all. It was trifling with the House to suggest that this was any compromise whatever.

MR. FLAVIN: They cannot take it away in their hands. They might take it away, but they would have to have a wrapper to take it away in.

MR. BOWLES said he did not wish to raise any difficulty and if the right hon. Gentleman could show that the wrapper would be supplied in every case he would sit down at once. If he could not, then he could only say that the whole thing was a sham.

MR. F. E. SMITH said a plain question was asked by an hon. Gentleman below the gangway as to whether it was the fact that this article would be enclosed in wrappers. The right hon. Gentleman explicitly and in terms replied that every portion sold would be contained in a wrapper. His hon. friend the Member for Norwood pointed out that there was not in the Bill a single security that milk-blended butter would be contained in wrappers, and when the right hon. Gentleman was asked for a clause in the Bill which showed that, he pointed to a clause which had no relation to it at all. He did not understand that small quantities were to be sold in wrappers.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that such wrappers were provided for in the Margarine Act.

MR. F. E. SMITH read the 6th section of the Margarine Act, and said he confessed he did not see the precise effect of "with a paper wrapper," and "in a paper wrapper." Was it to be delivered with a paper wrapper, and not in a paper wrapper?

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 22; Noes, 133. (Division List No. 329.)

AYES.

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Crean, Eugene
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, James
Forster, Henry William
Gilhooly, James
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Francis Lowe and Mr. Hugh Barrie.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour Robert (Lanark)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boland, John
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clough, William
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harvey, A. G. C.(Rochdale)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lewis, John Herbert
LloydGeorge, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price,C.E. (Edinburgh,Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradford
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. URE moved, in Clause 5, after the word "imported" to insert the words "bearing the same mark or description." The reason for the Amendment was that three times the price might sometimes be changed. It was found that as a matter of practice some mark was always put on butter showing that it came from the same source and was, therefore, of the same quality. This provision protected the man against whom the complaint was brought from being mulcted in three times the value of each consignment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 6, after the word 'import" to insert the words 'bearing the same mark or description.'"—(*Mr. Ure.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill," put, and agreed to.

MR. URE moved after the word "laboratories" to insert the words "or if the person who made the analysis be called as a witness, the evidence of that person." The Amendment simply made it quite clear that not only would the certificate be treated as evidence, but the man who made the analysis might also be called to give evidence.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 12, after the word 'laboratories,' to insert the words 'or if the person who made the analysis be called as a witness, the evidence of that person.'"—(*Mr. Ure.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE thought that the clause altered the practice which had generally been adopted with regard to legal proceedings. As he understood the clause, the certificate of the principal chemist in itself raised a presumption of guilt against the accused person. As a rule a person was supposed to be innocent until he was proved to be guilty, but he thought that under this clause, as proposed to be amended, the accused person would not be allowed to defend himself by cross-examining the chemist as to the statements in his certificate unless he gave a certain notice, and deposited a certain amount in court to pay the expenses of the person who had given the certificate. He thought that was hardly a right state for the law to be in.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now dealing with a matter which comes on later under another Amendment by the Solicitor-General for Scotland.

SIR F. BANBURY said he did not see the necessity of the words proposed. Could the principal chemist depute the analysis to some other person?

MR. URE said the evidence of one witness would be sufficient to secure a conviction. As the law stood at present the certificate of the analyst was sufficient, and therefore the evidence of the analyst ought to be sufficient.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. URE said that as the Bill stood it was left optional to the Court to allow the evidence of the analyst to be taken or not. That was thought to be giving too much discretion to the Court, and accordingly he moved an Amendment leaving to the defendent the option of calling the analyst, provided that he deposited a sum sufficient to cover the reasonable expenses of the analyst. This proposal would remove all doubt as to whether when the certificate was produced or the analyst gave his evidence the justice or the sheriff would be bound to convict. The words he proposed were the same as those which occurred in the Food and Drugs Act and the Margarine Act, and they left it to the Court to convict or acquit in the first instance on the analysis.

Amended proposed—

"In page 4, to leave out lines 16 to 21, and to insert the words, 'and the defendant shall not be entitled to require the person who made the analysis to be called as a witness unless he shall, at least three clear days before the return day, give notice to the prosecutor that he requires his attendance, and deposit with the prosecutor a sum sufficient to cover the reasonable costs and expenses of his attendance, which costs and expenses shall be paid by the defendant in the event of his conviction.'"—(*Mr. Ure*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE said this proposal altered the existing state of things, because, as a rule a person he had a perfect right to examine and cross-examine all the witnesses for the prosecution before there was any presumption of guilt raised against him. The certificate alone raised a presumption that the man was guilty before he had had any opportunity of defending himself, and he would only be able to cross-examine after giving notice and paying all the expenses of the attendance of the analyst. That was something which contravened every principle of English law and justice to which they had been accustomed in the past.

MR. F. E. SMITH said he was afraid that his hon. friend had not fully appreciated this Amendment. Upon the strict words of the clause there might be some doubt as to whether, on the production of the evidence provided for, it was conclusive proof by reason of insufficient evidence.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. URE moved the omission of Subsection 5. This was inserted in Committee in opposition to the Government. The subsection would give an appeal on matters of fact as well as of law. That was altogether contrary to the Customs code, which gave an appeal only on matters of law, and, moreover, it was altogether inapplicable to Scotland and Ireland. The subsection would introduce an undesirable precedent if allowed to stand. It dealt exclusively with England and was inapplicable to Ireland and Scotland. Where the prosecutors were the Commissioners of Customs, he did not think it was desirable that there should be an appeal on questions of fact from the Court of first instance.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, to leave out Subsection (5)."

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Words omitted accordingly.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) had standing in his name the following Amendment:—

"In page 4, line 34, at end to insert—'(b) For prohibiting the use as a preservative in milk of any substance specified in such regulations, or for prescribing the substances which may be used for such purpose in milk, or cream, or in the manufacture of butter, milk-blended butter or margarine, or for limiting the extent to which either generally, or as regards any particular substance or substances, preservatives may be used in milk or cream, or in the manufacture or sale of butter, milk-blended butter or margarine. Provided that as regards regulations made under subsection (b) hereof the expression "Local Government Board" shall be substituted for "Board of Agriculture" in section four of the said Act of 1899, and in the application of this section to Scotland "the Local Government Board" means the Local Government Board for Scotland.'"

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said the Amendment as it stood was not in order, being beyond the scope of the Bill.

MR. COCHRANE said he understood that the Local Government Board would be prepared to accept the Amendment in a different form.

*MR JOHN BURNS said that the Board would be quite willing to accept the Amendment in substance.

Mr. F. E. Smith.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 34, at end to insert—'(b) For prohibiting the use as a preservative of any substance specified in such regulations in the manufacture of butter, milk-blended butter or margarine, or for limiting the extent to which either generally, or as regards any particular substance or substances, preservatives may be used in the manufacture or sale of butter, milk-blended butter or margarine. Provided that as regards regulations made under subsection (b) hereof the expression "Local Government Board" shall be substituted for "Board of Agriculture" in section four of the said Act of 1899, and in the application of this section to Scotland "the Local Government Board" means the Local Government Board for Scotland.'"—(*Mr. John Burns.*)

*THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER: So far as I can see that is in order.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR EDWIN CORNWALL said he strongly objected to an Amendment being introduced in this slipshod manner. If the President of the Local Government Board and the hon. Member opposite had agreed upon the Amendment, it could have been made in another place. He did not see the representative of the Board of Agriculture present. That Board had not too many friends in the House, and he thought it ought to be protected against the Local Government Board.

MR. JOHN BURNS said the words of the Amendment had been agreed to by the Board of Agriculture. It was the desire of the representative of the Board not to send too many Amendments to another place.

MR. COCHRANE said he willingly accepted the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. F. E. SMITH said that on behalf of the legal profession he begged to thank the Government for introducing this Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 35, to leave out Subsection (2)"—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Question, "That Subsection (2) stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 39, to leave out from the word 'describes,' to end of clause, and insert the words 'it by any name other than "margarine" or a name combining the word "margarine" with a fancy or other descriptive name approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and printed in type not larger than the word "margarine," he shall be guilty of an offence under this Act.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. S. T. EVANS moved as an Amendment to the Amendment to insert after the word "than" in the fourth line the words "and in the same colour as." He said the object of that Amendment was very simple. Unless the words were inserted, it would be possible to print one word prominently and another word so faintly that the object which his hon. friend had in view would not be met.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"In line 4 after the word 'than' to insert the words 'and in the same colour as.'"—(*Mr. Evans.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Proposed words, as amended, there inserted in the Bill, agreed to.

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE said that if this new form of butter was to be legalised, it was very desirable that it should be known by a distinctive name for if they were to have a great variety of names for it the public would be sure to be confused and deceived. Already several names had been suggested, such as "Liberalissimo," "Perfecto," "Pumpine." It would be quite impossible for the public to identify under this great variety of names what they were really purchasing. Therefore he moved to omit the words "or names."

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 9, to leave out the words 'or names.'"—(*Sir Francis Lowe.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or names' stand part of the Bill."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that he understood the hon. Member's desire was that there should be one generic name for this article, instead of each person who made it being allowed to give it a name approved by the Board of Agriculture. He did not see what objection there could be to the proposal in the Bill as it stood. The position taken up in Clause 8 was that the article should be sold on its merits. Supposing a firm of the name of Pearks spent a large sum of money in advertising their manufacture, it would not be right that another manufacturer should have the advantage of Pearks' advertisement.

SIR F. BANBURY said he could not follow the argument of the hon. Baronet. If milk-blended butter was to be sold as Pearks' butter, it should be stated that it contained, say, 24 per cent. of water.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.) asked, on a point of order, whether an hon. Member was allowed to make free with the name of another hon. Member by way of illustration?

SIR F. BANBURY said that if the Amendment of his hon. friend was not adopted, and if Jones, Burns, or somebody else of somewhere else were allowed to give different names to this manufactured article, people would not know in the least what they were buying.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) thought the best way was to give the article a specific name, otherwise they might have the article sold under a score of different names in every town and village.

MR. F. E. SMITH said that if every tradesman was allowed to choose a separate fancy name for this article, which was not butter, the public would certainly not have the same security as they had in the case of a substance, such as margarine, which was known by one name only.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 115; Noes, 43. (Division List No. 330.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd

Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J.A. (Inverness-sh.)
Duckworth, James
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gardner,Col. Alan (Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Halpin, J.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hedges, A. Paget
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Marks,G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Paulton, James Mellor
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,SirG.Scott Bradf'rd
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sdipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset.E.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry(Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Barnes, G. N.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Cavendish,Rt. Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cory, Clifford John
Cullinan, J.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Forster, Henry William
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gretton, John
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Helme, Norval Watson
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Seddon, J.
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Francis Lowe and Sir Frederick Banbury.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY, in accordance with a former undertaking, moved to insert in the clause the words "setting out the percentage of moisture or water contained therein."

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, to leave out lines 18 to 21."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. BOWLES said this was a most unfit Amendment, especially after the proposed new clause had been rejected.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 23, to leave out the words 'as milk-blended butter or.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*SIR FRANCIS LOWE moved to insert at the end of Clause 9 (Penalties for offences):—"(3) An invoice describing an article as butter shall be deemed to be a sufficient written warranty that such article is pure butter, and shall be available as a defence under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, subject to the further provisions of Section 20 of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899." He thought that the additional penalties imposed by this Bill rendered it desirable that the defence of warranty by invoice should be allowed. It was already allowed under other Acts of Parliament, and having regard to the fact that the retailer was called upon to guarantee to his customers that the articles he sold to them were pure and what he described them to be, it seemed only right that he should receive a like warranty from the wholesale dealer from whom he bought them. It was contended by the promoters of the Bill that the retailer, after he had received the goods in bulk from the wholesale dealer; for instance a keg of butter, might break bulk and split it up into small quantities, and after having done that he might easily adulterate it without its being possible to detect the fraud on his part and bring it home to him. But they had no right to assume that the whole of the retailers of butter were fraudulent people, and that they would be more likely to adulterate their goods than the wholesale dealers from whom they purchased. And, after all, the wholesale dealer was quite sufficently protected under the sections of the Food and Drugs Acts referred to in the Amendment, and taken in conjunction with the provisions of those Acts, the implied warranty, which he proposed the invoice should be, would be perfectly innocuous and would do justice to all persons concerned.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY seconded. He thought if the invoice described the article as butter that should be sufficient.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 6, line 9, at the end to insert the words' '(3) An invoice describing an article as butter shall be deemed to be a sufficient written warranty that such article is pure butter, and shall be available as a defence under The Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1875, subject to the further provisions of section twenty of The Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899.' "—(*Sir Francis Lowe.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that the Amendment was plausible in its character, and personally he was in sympathy with it if it could be carried out without doing injury to any one. He pointed out, however, that the proper place for it was the Food and Drugs Act of 1899, but the late Government had absolutely refused to give effect to it. The suggestion was that, when a man was prosecuted by an inspector for selling adulterated butter, which he had adulterated himself in his own back premises, he should escape by producing the invoice as a warranty. What the hon. Member was asking for was that the invoice should be a warranty which should relieve the man who received it from any obligation at all. If he were prosecuted for selling adulterated butter he would go before the magistrates and say, "I had this stuff invoiced to me, and this invoice therefore is my warranty that it is perfectly pure." It might be said that it was a ridiculous thing to think that a man could go into a police court, and because he could say that he had had an invoice sent him, or even a warranty, he would be able to escape scot free. He would quote what he knew actually happened as regarded farmers. At the present moment farmers were unable to sell their milk unless able to give a warranty to the man who took it that the milk was pure. Milk was sent to a big centre and was bought by a middleman who would sell it to another man. The third man who bought it from the middleman adulterated the milk and he was prosecuted. He was brought up at the police court where he at once produced his warranty that the milk was pure milk, and said that he had sold it as he had received it. It was impossible to prove that the man had not sold it as he received it, and the consequence was that the magistrate dismissed the summons against the retailer, and a summons was then issued by the local authority against the farmer who gave a warranty with the milk. The farmer was then brought into court, and there was the greatest complaint in the agricultural districts regarding this. The farmers was fined by the magistrate for having adulterated the milk although it was adulterated after it had left his possession, and he was held to be liable although it had passed through several hands. If the Amendment were carried it would have exactly the same effect, that was to say, the retailer would be dismissed although he adulterated the butter, and the wholesale man would be prosecuted exactly the same as the farmer was prosecuted in respect of his milk, although he no more than the farmer had been guilty of adulteration. Therefore he thought the House would see the extreme difficulty of dealing with this matter. On the other hand, the retail grocer had the matter entirely in his own hands. He had the good invoiced as pure butter if he insisted on it, and he was perfectly protected in that matter. All he had to say to the wholesaler was that he refused to take the goods unless a proper invoice was given covering the warranty. On the other hand, what the hon. Member proposed was that the man who gave the invoice should be made responsible for the article whatever the conditions might be after it left his hands. Surely that would not be a proper state of things. Let them look at the matter from the point of view of the agriculturist who certainly considered he was under an absolute injustice that after goods had left his hands he should be held responsible. He could not help thinking that the wholesale man who sold butter to small retailers would be put in an equally unfair position. The wholesale merchant simply invoiced so much butter without giving a warranty for it, and he would run the risk of being haled before a magistrate as the farmer at the present moment was, and of being held up as a criminal for something he had never done. On these grounds alone it would be doing a great injustice to wholesale butter sellers to require an invoice to be deemed a warranty. On the other hand, it was perfectly open to the retailers to require an invoice showing that it was pure butter and they were perfectly well protected.

MR. MOND (Chester) said he wished to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Edgbaston Division. He could not say that he felt altogether convinced by the speech of the hon. Baronet who represented the Board of Agriculture. The grievance which had been raised was a serious one to a large number of small retailers, who were not in such a good position to obtain warranties as the hon. Baronet tried to make out. A great deal of his argument seemed to be based on an entire fallacy, because the object of the Amendment was really to make the invoice and the warranty one document instead of having an invoice and a warranty. Many small traders did not realise that an invoice was not a warranty. The inspector came down and seized some of their butter, and they were taken before the magistrate and fined, though perfectly innocent of the fact that the butter was not up to the standard it ought to have been. Of course a careful man with experience asked for a warranty besides the invoice. The evil consequences which might happen to the wholesale trader, and which did happen to the farmer, were not a question of invoice or warranty, but a question of warranty entirely. The hon. Baronet said that the farmer now gave a warranty, and on that warranty he was hauled up in some mysterious manner and fined for sending out milk which he said was not adulterated. The farmer, however, would have a simple remedy by sending out samples, and he could go into Court and prove that he did not adulterate the milk. The farmer was certainly much better able to prove whether or not the article he had sold to the retailer was adulterated or not. The picture of the retailer getting a firkin of butter and sitting in the back garden adulterating it and then saying he had not adulterated it was a little overdrawn. What frequently happened was that the small retailer, who was not experienced in the law of warranty, had stuff palmed off upon him or her by the unscrupulous wholesaler, who would not send it to an experienced firm. He thought that the argument that they ought not to make a change in respect of one article was no argument at all. If they never began on anything they would never get very far. Let them make a beginning with butter. In spite of the reply of the Government, he hoped they would think better of it, and if his hon. friend went to a division he for one would certainly support him.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said he remembered in 1899, when the Sale of Food and Drugs Act was passed, he was at the Local Government Board, and he presided over the Select Committee which inquired into the subject. At that time this question caused a great deal of friction and difficulty. The Local Government Board of the day stated a question for the opinion of the London Police Magistrates namely, whether an invoice made into a warranty would have any serious effect upon the working of the Act. The opinion of the Local Government Board of that day, based on the opinion of the Chief Magistrate, was that it would have a very prejudicial effect on the law, and the Government refused in the Act of 1899, for which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for

Wimbledon was responsible, to make an invoice a warranty, and he thought they were well advised. They knew that a great deal of fraud went on simply because many local authorities could not be got to act, and the result would be that if the Amendment were carried the administration of the Act would be very difficult, for the local authorities would be encouraged in giving the go-bye to prosecutions, because they would not go miles and miles outside their own areas to find the person who supplied the butter.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [22nd July], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Which Amendment was, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he desired to make a personal explanation. He had received a letter from the Postmaster-General, who had seen a curtailed report of his speech the other night, and his right hon. friend said that that report appeared to show that he had accused him of a breach of faith in not having produced a full statement of accounts before the final passage of the Bill. It would be in the recollection of the House that he had said nothing of the kind, and that there was nothing in the circumstances of the case to induce him to say it. All that he did say was that the Postmaster-General, having heard the discussion on the Second Reading and having promised a full statement of accounts, ought to have completed that promise by giving the House an opportunity a year or two hence of seeing what accounts he had produced and what were the results which they disclosed. He complained that the Postmaster-General, by refusing to accept the Amendments in Committee or on report, had denied that opportunity to the House. In that his right hon. friend disagreed with him: but a difference of opinion was a very different thing from a breach of faith. When he spoke last Monday he was in ignorance that the Postmaster-General was ill. One could not always know what effect one's words produced, but he sincerely hoped he had said nothing that even sounded discourteous.

SIR F. BANBURY said there were very serious objections to this Bill, and the objections which had been raised on both sides had not been met. It would be in the recollection of the House that his hon. friend the Member for Preston raised a very serious point upon the large expenditure of money involved in the Bill, and the Postmaster-General endeavoured to minimise it by saying that no larger sum than a million and a half should be spent in any one year, and though hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House and, to the best of his recollection, some hon. Members on the other side of the House, endeavoured to make that assurance certain by inserting words in the Bill the Postmaster-General refused to accept their Amendments. It was an extremely unfortunate thing that this moment, when the finances of the country were in such a bad state, should be chosen to raise so large a sum as six millions of money, and when in the opinion of many it was not necessary that that sum should be spent. They had pointed out that large sums would be required for the telephone service within the next three or four years, and their desire was that a smaller sum should be taken now to meet the ordinary requirements in lieu of the very large sum which the Postmaster-General asked for. The Postmaster-General endeavoured to meet their fears by saying that a public loan would not be required, but that the money would be provided by some department which at the moment happened to have a surplus. He did not recollect that the right hon. Gentleman said what department would find the money, but it did not make any difference as far as regarded the financial aspect of the case, because if the money was to be found by certain departments it was to be taken away from some other object, and, therefore, what they feared were the future inroads which must be made upon the money market. The Bill was rather a striking commentary upon the maxims of hon. Gentlemen opposite when his hon. friends were in power. Nothing then more aroused their ire than borrowing money on capital account to meet the really necessary expenditure of the nation—money to provide for efficient fortifications and for a strong Navy, which were, in his estimation, the most important things the country could provide for. Yet they were told that it was the very worst form of finance to raise money on capital account for those purposes. Here, however, was a question which was not urgent at all, and which could not be considered as a national question, and yet the Government proceeded to borrow six millions of money at a time when the money market was in a far worse condition than at any time when the present Opposition were in power. There had been a fall of eight points in Consols since hon. Gentlemen opposite came into power. He thought it right that a protest should be made on that side of the House, especially having regard to the fact that every day showed them that the statements and opinions of hon. Gentlemen opposite when in Opposition were vastly different from their actions when in power.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said that although he would not say in the absence of the Postmaster-General a word which he would not say to his face, the general policy of the Bill must have been shared in by the right hon. Gentleman's colleagues. This Bill proposed to raise a sum by annuities spread over a term. The late Government did the same thing in regard to works not less necessary and which were equally permanent, and the late Sir William Harcourt got up and said they were resorting to the methods of the "Extraordinary Budget," and imitating the ways of "South American Finance."

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) thought he was in a position to satisfy his hon. friend the Member for Preston, and also the other hon. Members who had spoken in this matter. He was fortunate enough to see his right hon. friend the Postmaster-General that morning and he desired him to express to the hon. Member for Preston his regret that he was unable to be present to defend his Department, and to explain the action which he had taken. The hon. Member for Preston had on a former occasion drawn attention to the fact that the ordinary financial statement made by the Post Office was not perhaps the best, and the Postmaster-General undertook to look into the matter. The Postmaster-General was now looking into the matter, and he had authorised him to state that he would, in consultation with the Treasury, endeavour to carry out the views of the hon. Gentleman in a way which, he believed, would be acceptable to his hon. friend. There were one or two other matters to which the hon. Member for Preston drew attention. As to the express messenger system, one of the reasons why the 3d. charge was retained was that we were under an international agreement and were bound to deliver 3d. letters from abroad, and therefore it would be invidious to make a distinction between home and foreign letters. But to show that the Postmaster-General was aware of the necessity of protecting and of making as large a profit for the Post Office as possible, six months ago he took the opportunity of making an extra charge of 3d. whenever any parcel was sent under the guise of a letter. With reference to the remarks made by the hon. Baronet the Member for the City who complained of the sum of £6,000,000 being taken, he begged to point out that seeing it was all raised by the creation of annuities annually provided for out of the Post Office Vote there was ample opportunity for the House to discuss the matter every year. In addition to that an opportunity would be provided for dealing with this question in three years, possibly, and certainly in four years, when in 1911 the whole of the telephone system would be taken over. Precedents showed that four years was by no means an extensive life for a Telephone Bill, inasmuch as the Telephone Bill of 1902 lived for four years, and that of 1900 for five years. The Post Office was doing nothing unusual in taking the whole sum of money at the present time, especially as the House was protected by the fact that they could deal with this question annually in addition to the present time and four years hence.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said he wished to express on this occasion—the last on which he would have an opportunity of doing so in this House—the gratification with which he heard the remarks of the hon. Member who had just spoken on behalf of the Postmaster-General. The complaint that he and others had made was that the representative of the Department came down with a view of asking for a large expenditure of money and was not prepared to offer any explanation of the Telephone Department of the Post Office while prepared vastly to increase the expenditure on the telephone system. He would take this opportunity of saying that he was glad, and he thought many members on the Opposition side were glad, to hear that the Post Office would next year—he believed he was not going beyond the statement of the hon. Member who had just spoken—present accounts to Parliament which would state clearly the exact financial position of the telephone system of the Post Office. He thought the action that they had taken in this matter had been justified by the results. So far as the raising of this large sum of money was concerned he must say that he looked with great alarm upon the inroads which this loan must inevitably make upon the money market at the present time. He knew the Government took a sanguine view of the position in the City. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated the other day that he expected a rise in the price of Consols and other securities. Since that statement was made he noticed that all the great funds and chief stock in the City had fallen, and there seemed no immediate prospect that the money market would improve. However it was useless, of course, to oppose this Bill, and he did not propose to prolong his opposition to it. In this case he was satisfied with the undertaking of the Government, and he proposed to go no further.

MR. HAROLD COX said that, in view of the explicit assurances of the hon. and gallant Member for Newington on behalf of the Postmaster-General in regard to the preparation of accounts, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

EVIDENCE (COLONIAL STATUTES) BILL.

Consideration, not amended (by the Standing Committee), deferred till Monday next.

AUSTRALIAN STATES CONSTITUTION BILL [LORDS].

Committee deferred till Monday next.

PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (No. 2) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'may,' to insert the words 'under and in accordance with the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. GLADSTONE moved to leave out Subsection (b) of Clause 2. He said the Amendment was worthy of explanation because in the Standing Committee he consented to accept the provision which he now proposed to leave out. The fact really was that on further consideration and in consultation with his right hon. friend near him they came to the conclusion that it ought to come out. The compulsory attendance age could not be above fourteen, and the result of putting in this particular provision would be that the senior boy in the school might be, and would be in fact under the Bill as it stood, the boy who had committed some offence and who was singled out by the court to be kept at school a year longer than anyone else. The effect would be that the senior boy, who would be the leader of the school, would have some sort of a taint about him, and it would be bad for him and for the other children. The senior boy in the school ought to be above reproach, and he was afraid the provision as it stood would have that effect. For that reason he begged to move the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out Subsection (b)."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, "That the subsection proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. LEIF JONES said he did not wish to oppose the Amendment of the Home Secretary if his right hon. friend really thought it was necessary; but he ventured to suggest that on occasions he might find it a misfortune that he had not reserved to himself the power, and he would ask him whether in exceptional circumstances it would not be well that a boy should be kept at school. He was bound to say that the position of the senior boy as outlined by his right hon. friend was a little fanciful as applied to the elementary schools of the country. He had never heard of such a senior boy in any of those schools, and he thought the illustration was taken from a public school.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY asked whether the Bill would not be brought into conformity with the Education Act if the subsection were simply altered to read "14" instead of "15."

Amendment agreed to.

*Mr. GLADSTONE said the next Amendment standing in his name to provide that the Court by which a probation order was made should furnish to the offender a notice in writing stating in simple terms the conditions he was required to observe was to carry out a promise he made to the Standing Committee.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 7, at the end, to add the words 'The court by which a probation order is made shall furnish to the offender a notice in writing, stating in simple terms the conditions he is required to observe.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*Mr. GLADSTONE moved an Amendment to provide for the appointment, where circumstances permitted, of special probation officers, to be employed in cases where the offender was a person under sixteen years of age. He said this Amendment was also to carry out a promise he made to the Committee.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 14, at the end, to insert the words 'There shall be appointed, where circumstances permit, special probation officers to be called children's probation officers, who shall, in the absence of any reasons to the contrary, be employed in cases where the offender is a person under the age of sixteen.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. LEIF JONES moved as an Amendment to the proposed Amendment to add the words "provided that police officers shall not be appointed children's probation officers." He thanked his right hon. friend for the Amendment he had brought forward, and which fulfilled the pledge he gave to the Committee. He thought it was very advantageous to provide that there should be, where circumstances permitted—and he hoped that circumstances very often would permit—special probation officers for dealing with children. He felt that without these officers the Act would fail very much in the purpose for which it was designed, but he also thought that the Amendment which he had put down would strengthen the clause, and would carry out the intention of the Committee with regard to this matter, which was to keep the children as far as possible from the operations of the ordinary law, which would not be the case if they had policemen as probation officers. He wished to make no reflection on the police in saying this, but it was a fact that on ordinary occasions they had to discharge duties which made them unsuitable for the discharge of the very different duties of probation officers. He thought everyone with experience of the subject would admit that, and he would not argue the case. Everyone was aware of the purpose which he had in moving this Amendment. It was to keep the children apart from anything which savoured of the ordinary law, that the probation officer might be the friend, and the welcome friend, of the children. Therefore, he begged to move his Amendment to the proposed Amendment.

Mr. BYLES seconded, and said he cordially agreed with the remarks just made by his hon. friend, both on behalf of a humanitarian organisation which had communicated with him and in accordance with the view he expressed in Committee.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"At the end, to add the words 'provided that police officers shall not be appointed children's probation officers.'"—(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added to the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) said he was very glad the Home Secretary had proposed his Amendment for the appointment of special probation officers, and he thought it was a very great improvement to the Bill. He could not agree that the suggested words of the hon. Member for the Appleby Division of Westmoreland were an improvement. He thought there were many instances in country districts in which the police officer would be a suitable officer for the purpose; in fact, in many cases there was no one else available, and he failed to see why the police officer should be looked upon with suspicion. His experience was that the young people of the country districts for which he spoke specially had no better friend than the police officer, than whom no man knew better what were their wants and the dangers which surrounded them. Nor did he think they ought to make a special exception and prevent police officers being appointed. Of course the clause was not mandatory. Those who had the appointment in their hands could appoint any person they liked under the clause, and it might often happen that other people were available who would make equally good officers; but he protested against a police officer being specially named as a person who was not to be appointed, and he trusted the Home Secretary would not accept the Amendment.

*MR. GLADSTONE said, while he agreed with what his hon. friend said, he hoped he would not press this Amendment. He thought it stood to reason that the person appointed as children's probation officer in the large towns would have to give so much time to looking after the children that it would be quite impossible for him to discharge the duties of a policeman, and it was quite clear to him that those who had the appointing of children's probation officers would not as a general rule appoint policemen. On the whole he hoped his hon. friend would not press the Amendment, because it was conceivable that in some places it might be desirable to appoint a policeman. This Bill was an experiment. They wanted to feel their way, and they did not want to tie themselves down, especially with regard to the duties of probation officers, more than they could help. For his part, he should prefer, if his hon. friend would allow them, a free hand in this matter. There was one other point, and that was, although he did not think the police would feel aggrieved if this were put in the Bill, yet it did make a distinction between the police and other people, which he was inclined to think was rather hard, as the policeman was as capable of looking after the interests of children as anyone else. Therefore, he deprecated the distinction being made, and hoped his hon. friend, under the circumstances, would not press this Amendment, as he was sure his own wishes would be met without the Amendment.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said that without in any way pressing the Amendment, or asking the House to do so, or even discussing it at this late hour, he ventured to add his expression of regret that the Home Secretary had taken the course he had. He quite felt it was the Home Secretary's Bill, but the object of the measure as he understood it on the Second Reading was that the probation officer was not to be a uniformed man either in respect of grown up persons or children. It was not a question of policemen not being kindhearted, because they were; but if a man or boy were in employment, he would not like a policeman to call upon him two or three times a week. If they left, as they were leaving, in this Bill vague and experimental powers in the hands of probation officers, it seemed that the least they could do was to restrict the discretion of magistrates who naturally would turn to the person who was nearest at hand. He ventured to think that the effect of the Bill might be not in the least what was the intention of the promoters if they allowed any uniformed person to carry out the duties of that officer, which were not meant to be anything in the nature of police supervision, but rather in the nature of the work which was so well done at the present time by the police court missionaries. On the Second Reading he understood the idea was rather to subsidise the police court missionaries, and not to set up a fresh body of officials to deal with this subject.

*Mr. STUART WORTLEY asked to be allowed to put a point of view in support of the Home Secretary which showed that the Amendment to the Amendment would operate with some hardship upon the policeman himself. It was quite conceivable that the duties of the children's probation officer being rather arduous in a large town might take up a man's whole time, and if the officer were a policeman the police authority would be inclined to detach that man from ordinary duties and put him into plain clothes. No one would desire the man to become permanently detached from the force and lose his pension and other advantages, and for that reason he thought the hands of the authority should be left free.

*Mr. LEIF JONES asked if he might be allowed to explain that it was very far from his purpose to make any reflection on the police or their kindness of heart, of which he had had a very great deal of experience. The duties which they had to discharge, however, were different from those of probation officers. He thought his right hon. friend the Home Secretary quite shared that view, and he therefore asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment to the Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

Mr. GLADSTONE said the next Amendment in his name was a drafting Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, lines 35 and 36, to leave out the words 'having power to deal with the offender in respect of his original offence,' and insert the words 'before which an offender is bound by his recognisance under this Act to appear for conviction or sentence.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments proposed to the Bill, and agreed to:—

"In page 6, line 4, to leave out the word 'two,' and insert the word 'three.'"

"In page 6, line 18, after the word 'to' to insert the words 'Ireland "Lord-Lieutenant" shall be substituted for "Secretary of State" and each division of.'"

"In page 6, line 19, to leave out the words 'a division of that district.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

RELEASED PERSONS (POOR LAW RELIEF) BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; read the third time, and passed.

VACCINATION BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; read the third time, and passed.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [Lords].

Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Attorney-General.*)

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

MUNICIPAL MILK DEPOTS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

PATENTS AND DESIGNS (CONSOLIDATION) BILL.

Read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House this day.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 29th July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10).

Also the Certificate that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Post Office Sites.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Swansea Harbour Bill.—Reported, with Amendments.

Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment. The said Amendment considered, and agreed to.

Coventry Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Humber Conservancy Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill; Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill.—Read 3^a (according to Order) and passed.

ARMAGH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Bill read 3^a, with the Amendment

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I have an Amendment on the Paper to leave out a certain proviso in Clause 49 of this Bill, and I think it will be for your Lordships' convenience that I should explain why I am impelled to adopt this somewhat unusual course. I have no wish to interfere with the object of the Bill. Its object is to enable the urban district council of Armagh to acquire certain tolls and market rights in the city, those rights having been held by a body of trustees since 1821. This body obtained before a Committee of the other House terms with which they were evidently satisfied, as they did not oppose the Bill in your Lordships' House; and in the action I am taking I am not in any way attempting to affect one way or the other the terms of that agreement. The proviso which I object to has been introduced in your Lordships' House, through which this Bill has passed as an uncontested Bill. The operative words of the proviso are that, in the case of

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

the present holder of the office of clerk he shall—

> "Continue to hold his said office until he die, or resign, or be removed by the council with the assent of the Board."

This particular provision, the object of which is to benefit one particular individual, is an exceptional provision in an Act of Parliament. The proviso, I understand, has been introduced by the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees at the request of the promoters. I am not proposing to attack the Lord Chairman; that is the last thing I should dream of doing, and if the noble Earl rises in his place and states that he would deprecate your Lordships removing this proviso in the interests of the proper working of the Bill I should not think of pressing my Amendment; but I hope he will not take that course. It is impossible to consider this question apart from one or two little incidents in the local political history of Armagh. One party for a long time had a majority on the urban district council. It happened to be the Unionist party, but that point is quite immaterial. On the other party coming into power one of the first things they did was to "worry out" the old clerk, and in his place they appointed a friend of their own. Now they evidently seem to think that, as the triennial election is coming on, there is a danger of their friend in his turn being "worried out." Therefore this proviso has been inserted at the last moment to give him additional security in case the Nationalist party happen to lose at the polls next January. This is a thing which I should object to no matter by what party it was done. The reason is not a sufficient one to justify a change in the general law of the land, and on that ground I ask your Lordships to strike the proviso out of the clause and restore the Bill to the position on this point in which it was when it came up from the other House.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 28, line 21, to leave out from '1878' to the end of the clause."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, the noble Earl is correct in stating that this proviso has been introduced in your Lordships' House. I understand that it was put into the Bill after consultation between the promoters and the Irish Local Government Board, who apparently saw no objection to the insertion of the words which the noble Earl now asks the House to delete. As a rule, it is undesirable that Amendments should be moved on the Third Reading of a Bill. These Amendments generally involve points which ought to be thrashed out before the tribunal upstairs, where both sides can be heard. But, as the noble Earl has told your Lordships quite fairly, this is merely a question of party majorities in the urban district council of Armagh; and therefore I do not think I have any observation to make, except to say that it appears to me to be a case which may very properly be left to the consideration of the House without any expression of opinion on my part on one side or the other.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I have only just received instructions regarding this Amendment, which I am asked to resist on behalf of the Irish Office. I am not as familiar as the noble Earl with the political history of the matter, but I am informed that this proviso was inserted with the unanimous consent of the urban district council of Armagh and also with the consent of the Local Government Board of Ireland. I understand that when the Bill went before the Police and Sanitary Committee it was realised that it did not authorise the town clerk of Armagh to take proceedings for breach of its provisions, and consequently the clause now before the House was inserted as an Amendment. I also understand that there is a direct precedent, for in Section 2, Subsection (4), an almost precisely similar thing was done in the Act of 1896 in regard to the urban district of Armagh. In these circumstances I trust the noble Earl will not press the Amendment.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, it is clear that this question has been rather sprung upon your Lordships. I do not in the least complain that the matter has been dealt with very shortly by the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office, because none of us had any idea that it was going to be raised until we saw the Amendment on the Paper. The noble Earl the Lord Chairman, of course, speaks with authority when he deprecates Amendments being moved on Third Reading; but the answer which has been given by Lord Denman has not in the least cleared from my mind the impression that this proviso was inserted by the urban district council of Armagh merely to "job" in permanently one of their own political friends. I do not think that is too hard an expression to use. It seems to me a very remarkable thing that in a Bill of this importance a provision should be inserted merely for the benefit of one individual. The noble Lord who has just sat down informed the House that in the year 1896 the same thing was none by the town council of Armagh, but whether that was so or not it is none the less a remarkable course to pursue. In these circumstances I think my noble friend will be justified in pressing the Amendment.

The Earl of MAYO: My Lords, the real meaning of this proviso is to give the appointment to this particular man for the whole of his life. The party in power on this urban district council are afraid of being beaten at the next local elections, and to make the appointment of their friend quite sure they have slipped in this proviso. The noble Earl the Chairman of Committees has left the matter to the House, and I hope your Lordships will decide upon it yourselves. The statement has been made by Lord Denman that the Local Government Board gave their consent, but I understood that the Board simply pointed out that the proviso would make the appointment permanent. I do not understand that they gave their consent.

Lord DENMAN: I am informed that they did give their consent.

The Earl of MAYO: Then I am very sorry. I protest against this proviso being inserted for a political reason and simply to benefit one person. I hope the House, having heard the arguments, will decide upon the matter.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: Might I ask what the meaning is of the part of the clause which precedes the proviso? Does it mean that all future clerks are to be removable? If that is the meaning of the clause, and if this proviso is for the purpose of giving an exceptional position and an exceptional tenure of office to this individual, it appears to me that it is a very wrong thing to do. What I wish to know is this, Is this gentleman to hold his office on a tenure different from that of his predecessor and from that which will obtain in the case of his successors?

Lord COURTNEY of PENWITH: My Lords, I enter on this discussion with great hesitation. I only know what has been said to-night on this question, and the proposition seems to me on the face of it to be an extraordinary one. But scarcely any Member of your Lordships' House is really well informed on the subject, and I therefore suggest that it would be most becoming if the debate were adjourned for a couple of days, by which time the Irish Office would be able to tell us what the proposal exactly means, and why they assented to it.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: I regard the suggestion which has just been made as very unreasonable. Of course I quite understand the motive, the benches opposite being very sparsely occupied. My Amendment has been on the Paper for five or six days, and plenty of notice has been given. The case is perfectly plain. I do not understand why the Irish Office support this clause, and I do not want to. The proviso itself is quite enough for me, and as a general proposition I object to it.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): I do not think the Amendment and the proposal for the adjournment of the discussion are in the least degree affected by the relative strength of the two sides of the House. But I, like other noble Lords, desire to know more in regard to the origin of, and the reasons for, this exceptional and peculiar clause. It is far better that we should know what the facts are, and I think the sensible thing would be, if Lord Courtney will move it, to put the discussion off for a couple of days, so that the Irish Office may have an opportunity of fully explaining the matter

Moved, "That the debate be adjourned."—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith.*)

EARL CAWDOR: After what has fallen from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack I would appeal to my noble friend behind me to accept the Motion which has just been moved. I am sure none of us wish to impute any motive in the matter, but it is generally admitted that this is a strange and unusual proceeding.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Might I ask the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office if he can answer the question I put to him just now?

LORD DENMAN: I cannot give an answer off-hand, but I will obtain the information by Thursday, on which day I suggest the adjourned debate should be taken.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and the further debate adjourned accordingly to Thursday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 530. Northern Territories of the Gold Coast (Report of 1906).

No. 531. Sierra Leone (Report for 1906).

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for Secondary Schools (Wales) (in force from 1st August, 1907).

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3872. Peru (Ignitos).

No. 3873. Turkey (Baghdad).

No. 3874. Brazil (Pará).

No. 3875. Costa Rica.

No. 3876. United States.

No. 3877. France (St. Nazaire).

Lord Loreburn.

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (SCOTLAND).

Fifty-first Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General for Scotland, of births, deaths, and marriages, in Scotland. Abstracts of 1905.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, GALWAY.

Annual Report of the President, for the year 1906–1907.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Report of the Commissioners, for the period from 1st April, 1906, to 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (INCORPORATION OF NUNEATON).

Charter of Incorporation of the borough of Nuneaton, dated the 22nd of July 1907.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Return for the year ended 31st March, 1907, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted under Rule 2 of the regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act to hold civil employment of profit under public departments.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LONDON CORPORATION.

Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London, for the year 1906. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª To-morrow.—(*The Lord Granard.* [*Earl Granard.*) (No. 138.)

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next.—(*The Earl Carrington.*) (No. 134).

PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (No. 2) BILL. (No. 135.)

RELEASED PERSONS (POOR LAW RELIEF) BILL. (No. 136.)

VACCINATION BILL. (No. 137.)

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed.

KING'S BENCH DIVISION—ADDITIONAL JUDGE.

*THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I rise for the purpose of moving that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in the King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876.

I ought first to explain to your Lordships why it is that we are proceeding by an Address instead of by a Bill. The fact is that the Act of 1876 enacted that when two out of the four Judges of the Appellate Council, as they were then, died or resigned it should be competent upon an Address for the Crown to appoint an extra Judge of the High Court, and to make a similar appointment on the death or resignation of the other two. All the four Judges mentioned in the Act of 1876 have died or resigned, but only one extra Judge has been appointed by an Address, at the instance of my noble and learned friend Lord Halsbury. That was, I think, in the year 1899, and the point now is whether your Lordships are prepared to present an Address to the Crown for the appointment of a second Judge so as to exhaust the powers created by the Act of 1876. That, of course, depends upon whether the state of business in the High Court is such as, in the opinion of Parliament, to require that this appointment should be made.

Our ideal should be as far as we can to see that there are no arrears in any Court; it is a high ideal, but one at which we should aim, and I believe that in substance, with an adequate number of Judges, it might be attained. In many instances the delay of justice is almost equivalent to the denial of justice, and it is a very lamentable state of things that there should be long lists of unheard cases which are the occasion of great expense, uncertainty, and continued mortification to His Majesty's subjects. In the Chancery Division there are at present substantially no arrears, but it was not always so, and some eight years ago there was a block of business in that division. In order to remove that block one of the two Judges mentioned in the Act of 1876 was appointed, and the Judges of the Chancery Division are able frequently to assist the King's Bench Division in getting rid of their work. In the Probate and Divorce Division also there are substantially no arrears. Such arrears as there are may be partly due to the continued absence of the President, who deserves the thanks of the community for the assiduous way he has devoted himself to assisting the Court of Appeal in a time of great difficulty.

Next comes the King's Bench Division, and I am glad to see the Lord Chief Justice present, for Lord Alverstone is the highest authority in regard to the business of that division. There is now substantially the same amount of arrears that there has been for the last ten years —that is to say, about 500 cases still remaining unheard. I do not know how long a period of waiting that may mean, but I do know it would be much better—and I am quite sure the Lord Chief Justice would agree with me—if the whole of those arrears could be swept off. They have been existing for about ten years and have continued substantially at about the same level; therefore, it may be fairly inferred that if once that incubus were removed the King's Bench Division would be once more in smooth waters. There is no question that the circuit system, to which reference was made in the debate in the House of Commons, does involve some difficulty, and I think the system admits of great improvement. I hope those improvements will be carried out. I hope also it will be remembered that it is desirable that His Majesty's Judges should be seen in the country in different towns administering justice as they have been from time immemorial.

I come next to the Court of Appeal. I do not see my noble and learned friend Lord Collins in his place. He could speak with very great authority in regard to the business of that Court, which he has only recently quitted, but the business of the Court of Appeal is blocked, and has been blocked for some years. The block has been substantially the same for some years, and, unfortunately, it shows no tendency to diminish. On the contrary, the tendency is towards an increase. In justice to the learned Judges of the Court of Appeal, it must be said that this state of things is in no sense due to any want of energy, devotion, or of high capacity on their part. It is one of those things which it is the duty of all interested in the administration of justice to remove as quickly as possible. Last year I myself sat for three or four weeks in the Court of Appeal endeavouring to assist my brethren in the Court in disposing of business. But I am sorry to say, with the best goodwill imaginable, it is almost impossible to expect any one holding my office to be able to find an appreciable amount of time for the purpose of sitting in the Court of Appeal. There is the business of your Lordships' House and of the Privy Council, which has prior claims on the Lord Chancellor's time.

Unless some legislative change is made I see no way of removing the arrears in the Court of Appeal. A Bill has been passed through this House authorising two Judges sitting as a branch of the Court of Appeal to take such cases as might be assigned to them by the Master of the Rolls with the consent of the Lord Chancellor. What the fate of that Bill may be in the House of Commons with its block of business I do not pretend to say. I am afraid it is only one of the numerous instances in which the public do unquestionably suffer by the unavoidable pressure of business in the House of Commons. The present condition of business in the Court of Appeal is a justification for the Address your Lordships are now asked to sanction. The appointment of an additional Judge would diminish the arrears of business in the King's Bench Division, and would release for the Court of Appeal, if necessary, either the Lord Chief Justice or the President of the Probate and Divorce Division.

About two or three months ago I asked a number of distinguished gentlemen to sit upon a Committee for the purpose of considering the whole of our judicial business, and of making proposals for reform or amendment. Lord Macnaghten is president, the chiefs of all the Courts are members, and there are also on the Committee distinguished Judges, barristers, and some solicitors. I trust the result of the labour of this Committee will be to organise and improve, not only the circuit system, but the administration of business in London, and also to provide for the improvement of the intermediary proceedings between the commencement of an action and the time when it comes to trial, so that there shall be more speedy justice, for in regard to giving justice I think *Bis dat qui cito dat.* I beg to move the Motion standing in my name.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty representing that the state of business in the High Court of Justice is such as to require the appointment of an additional Judge, and praying that His Majesty will be graciously pleased to appoint a new Judge of the said High Court in the King's Bench Division thereof, in pursuance of the eighteenth section of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876." — (*The Lord Chancellor.*)

*LORD ALVERSTONE: My Lords, I desire, in the first place, to thank the Lord Chancellor for his courtesy in allowing this Motion to be postponed to a day when I could address a few observations to your Lordships without interfering with the business of the circuit on which I was engaged. My noble and learned friend's speech makes it unnecessary for me to add more than a few words. It is perfectly true that the King's Bench Division has been struggling for the last four or five years to reduce the arrears. In several kinds of work there has been an increase, and it has become impossible to give that prompt hearing of causes set down for trial which is desirable. An additional difficulty has been created by the Court of King's Bench being called upon to aid other Courts. The Lord Chancellor has referred to the fact that the President of the Probate and Admiralty Division has rendered excellent assistance to the Court of Appeal; but that has necessitated a Judge of the King's Bench Division being withdrawn to meet the absence of the President of the Probate Division, and, as the Lord Chancellor has observed, it has been necessary from time to time to ask the Chief Justice to go to the Court of Appeal in order that there might not be an absolute stoppage of one division of the Court of Appeal. Therefore the case made by the Lord Chancellor admits of no answer; it is absolutely essential that there should be an additional Judge of the King's Bench Division. I trust that the result of giving to the King's Bench Division an additional Judge will be that the work of the Division will be brought in a few years to the condition to which the Lord Chancellor has referred.

It has been suggested in the course of the discussion on this question in another place that a great part of the difficulty in grappling with arrears in London is due to the circuit system. It has been said that there is a deplorable waste of time and energy on the part of the Judges in connection with the circuit system, and that a slight alteration in the business of the King's Bench Division would make this Motion unnecessary. All I can say is that, if a slight modification of the business in the division over which I have the honour to preside would make the appointment of a new Judge unnecessary, it would be a great discredit to those who have to do with the King's Bench Division if that slight modification was not carried into effect. But, unfortunately, those who have expressed that opinion, some of them not having much experience of the circuit system, have not told us what that modification is. If the country is led to believe that by a modification of the circuit system any substantial increase of judicial time can be obtained, they will be very much mistaken. It has been asserted that the Judges go down to circuit towns to receive white gloves, and that they occupy their time, which might be more usefully employed, in going about the country. For that suggestion there is absolutely no foundation. Owing to there being days fixed in advance, a system which has the full support of the Lord Chancellor, in order that there might be no public inconvenience, it is a fact that on rare occasions there are one or two idle days. But the public do not know that the business of the circuit at the present time is only got through by the Judges of the King's Bench Division sitting much earlier and also later than they sit in London. They constantly sit at 10 a.m., and continue sitting until six or seven o'clock in the evening.

We have also heard suggestions made by persons who do not know the facts of waste of time on Commission days. There is no greater mistake. Commission days are the days in which the Judges travel from one town to another. I think no single circuit has occurred on which I have not had to sit on Commission day. On nearly all the circuits one or more of the Judges have travelled "in their own time" in order to be able to finish the work at one place before going on to the next. I give these simple facts in order that, on my own authority and on behalf of my brethren, whom I have consulted, it should be distinctly stated that there can be no gain of judicial strength for London or the other great centres by modifying the circuit system.

That brings me to a far more important point. We have heard a great deal about London, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Bristol, and other great centres, and of course they ought to be considered. But the rights of the counties have also to be considered. The Lord Chancellor has already said that he entirely supports the view that the Judges of the King's Bench Division should go year by year into the counties to administer justice in the assize towns. It is most important that that system should be continued. We have to consider this question, not in regard to the number of cases, but in regard to the class of cases, that have to be tried. There are questions of boundaries and rights of way, actions for defamation, local breaches of contract, and local accidents. It is the right of a man to have his case tried locally, and it is of enormous importance to a man whose character has been defamed to have a local trial. It is of the essence of our system of civil justice that a Judge of the High Court should go down to the counties, that a man might have his rights determined and his wrongs redressed in the place where he is known and where witnesses can without difficulty and expense come and give their testimony.

I have been quite recently at Dolgelly in North Wales. The two cases put down as not being worth going for included a right of way action promoted by the district council, and involving the calling of sixty witnesses. That case was heard in two days and a half. I ask, what would have happened if these assizes had not been held, and the witnesses had been compelled to be taken at considerable expense to a distant Court? That system of local trial, which I believe is for the general advantage of the community, cannot be maintained unless at regular intervals the Judges go into the counties so that justice may be administered locally.

Somebody has suggested that Commissioners should be appointed to go down to do criminal work. On that matter I appeal to the experience of my noble friend on the Woolsack, and if he were here I might appeal to the long experience of Lord Halsbury. Apart from the appointment of Commissioners in cases of illness, in order to remove great pressure, it is not a system on which we ought to rely for the administration of justice. It is desirable that absolutely independent Judges should go down and try these cases. The reason for the confidence that is felt in the administration of justice, is, I think, that, almost entirely, the Courts have been presided over by men who have no connection with the locality. Valuable as their services have been, the Commissioners would be the first to admit that it is not a system to which resort ought to be had more than is absolutely necessary.

Sir Henry Fowler, for whose opinion I have great respect, has spoken about the extension of the jurisdiction of the County Courts. I desire to say that in my opinion the jurisdiction of the County Courts has been extended as far as it can go; I do not know whether it has not gone too far. Difficult points of law may arise where only a few pence are involved. County Court Judges will themselves agree that it is not their function to deal with the long and important cases that can only be tried in many hours, and sometimes in days, which are now tried at assizes. Any attempt further to extend the County Court jurisdiction would tend not only largely to impede the useful performance of the duties of County Court Judges, but would also certainly tend to a much larger block of the business of the higher branch of the Court by the necessity for the revision and consideration of cases on appeal. I hope and trust that it is now coming to be recognised that appeals are too numerous, and might, without disadvantage to the public, be curtailed.

I trust that the Committee which is now sitting will be able to make a Report which will save judicial time, and tend to the cheapening of legal procedure. But I am quite certain that the Courts cannot do their work effectively with the present number of Judges. I will not forecast what would be necessitated by other work which would be thrown upon them. All I say is this, that this instalment—and I am very grateful to the Lord Chancellor for being good enough to support it—is one which is absolutely necessitated by the existing condition of things. I trust that, whatever may be the demands upon judicial strength and whatever may be the requests made to the country to provide additional Judges, no attempt will be made to depart from the system by which Judges of the High Court are sent down to the counties twice a year to deal with both civil and criminal work. I believe that has been one of the main reasons why our judicial system has been so thoroughly satisfactory to the public.

*LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, there is one matter in connection with this subject which my noble and learned friend did not mention, but which I am anxious to state to the House. Reference has been made to the desirability that there should be no congestion in our Courts, and I think it is worthy of mention that at the end of to-morrow's sitting there will be no cause remaining unheard in your Lordships' House, and the same observation may be made in respect to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That is a record. I believe once before a Lord Chancellor claimed that he had achieved this, but there was a little inaccuracy in that claim. I believe that my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack has now achieved a record. This satisfactory state of things is mainly due to the manner in which my noble and learned friend has presided over us and performed the duties of his office; and in that he has set an example for other Courts to follow. In making this acknowledgment I desire to say that this is not a matter of comparison between my noble and learned friend and other Lord Chancellors, for I could also bear testimony to the good work done in this direction by Lord Halsbury and to the great knowledge and ability he displayed in presiding over us. I do not wish to enter further into the discussion as to the circuits; but,-while I agree with my noble and learned friend the Lord Chief Justice as to the principle of maintaining the circuit system, still I think that the waste of judicial strength under that system is very great and is detrimental to the interests of justice.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly; the said Address to be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

Order of the Day read for the House being put into Committee.

*LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, I think it my duty to say a few words of explanation before asking your Lordships to consider this Bill in Committee. The Select Committee to whom your Lordships referred the Bill did not fail to afford an opportunity for criticism or objection to all the principal shipping and insurance associations who might conceivably be interested in the question. But very few of these associations thought it necessary to avail themselves of that opportunity. It transpired that there was no objection whatever to the principle of the Bill, but some weighty reasons were put forward for imposing certain conditions on the owners of barges in consideration of their receiving the privilege of limited liability. The Select Committee have embodied a provision in the Bill giving effect to that recommendation and empowering the Board of Trade to make regulations in regard to the manning and the gear of barges. With these few words I beg to move that the House do resolve itself into the said Committee.

Moved, "That the House resolve itself into Committee."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee (according to Order.)

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

LORD AMPTHILL: I beg to move that the Amendments inserted by the Select Committee be agreed to.

Moved, "That these Amendments be agreed to."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: If the noble Lord will turn to Clause 2, line 23, he will see the words—

> "Or by any public body authorised to measure any lighter, barge, or like vessel."

Those words appear to the Board of Trade to be rather too wide, and if the noble Lord will move an Amendment to meet this point on Third Reading the Board of Trade will have no objection to the Bill passing in its present form.

LORD AMPTHILL: I see no objection to the omission of those words, but I would prefer that the noble Earl who represents the Board of Trade should take the initiative in the matter.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday the 6th of August next.

PUBLIC BILLS.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I beg to move that during the remainder of the present session all Bills which come from the House of Commons shall be printed in such manner as to show what parts, if any, have been passed by means of the closure. Under present circumstances I think the motives for this Motion will be apparent to all, and therefore it will not be necessary for me to detain your Lordships with any lengthy remarks. It is quite plain that your Lordships are going to be called upon at very short notice to consider a number of important measures. It is therefore most desirable that of the short time which is allotted to us we should waste as little as possible in arriving at the meaning and intention of those measures, and therefore it is desirable that we should be in a position to ascertain how much of the measures has been discussed in the other House. The use of the closure seems to increase every day. Thirty of the forty-two clauses of the Territorial Forces Bill were passed in the House of Commons under the closure. But that measure was at least considered in Committee of the Whole House, and not in Grand Committee, which has now in respect of most Bills been substituted for Committee of the Whole House. There is no official record whatever of what takes place in Grand Committee, and as it is most important that we should know what happens there I have put down this Motion, which provides, as far as I can see, the only means of ascertaining that information. I would point out that the Motion refers both to procedure in Committee and procedure on other stages of Bills.

Moved, "That during the remainder of the present session all Bills which come from the House of Commons shall be printed in such manner as to show what parts, if any, have been passed by means of the closure."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, the wording of the noble Earl's Motion is somewhat vague. It is not quite clear whether the noble Earl intends only to apply his Motion to what is known as the guillotine, or closure by compartments, or whether he desires to have a distinct record kept of every case in which the closure had been applied to a clause, however long the discussion might have been.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I said every case in which the closure had been applied, as well as the other.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: So far as the Whole House is concerned that, of course, could be done, but I think the result might be of a somewhat misleading character. It would be simple so far as regards the closuring of a whole clause, but the fact that the closure had been applied at some time or another during the debate could not justify, I think, this House in drawing the inference that the matter had not been sufficiently discussed, and it would really be necessary for a noble Lord, in order to inform himself properly on the subject, to look at the debate and see what length of time had been occupied and whether the particular point had been adequately discussed or not. Of course, we should all naturally agree that it is desirable that the House should be fully informed as to the degree of discussion that has taken place elsewhere; but the question of how that is to be done by a sort of labour-saving appliance such as that of the noble Earl is a very different matter. There is no closure by compartment in Grand Committee, and, therefore, it would be necessary, I suppose, in order to gain a really true idea of what had happened, after stating that the closure had been applied, also to state after what degree of discussion it had been applied. That is really an entirely impossible task for the officers of the House to undertake. I feel some sympathy, I confess, with the object of the noble Earl's motion, but it appears to me of so unpractical a character that it is quite impossible to assent to what he desires without, in fact, misleading the House to an extent which, I am sure, the noble Earl himself would regret.

THE EARL OF MAYO: Putting aside the question of Grand Committee, and dealing only with the closure when enforced in the House of Commons, I suggest that it would be very easy to print the Bill with two lines where the closure was enforced after discussion, and with one line where particular clauses were closured by compartments.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I hope His Majesty's Government will make an effort to supply at any rate some information upon this very important point. The noble Earl the Lord President said with great frankness that in his opinion it is very desirable that this House should know the extent to which Bills had been discussed in the other House. Surely, it cannot be altogether beyond the power of those who have charge of the preparation of these documents to devise some means of showing us, at any rate to some extent, whether a Bill has been debated or not. I imagine that in some cases certain parts of a Bill are not discussed owing to the application of the closure in the House, and in other cases they are not discussed even in the Committee room upstairs. Is it not possible to show, by a marginal indication of some kind, whether a particular clause has escaped discussion either in the House or in the Committee, or in both? I do not want to press the subject unduly this evening, but I think, if the noble Earl would instruct whoever advises him with regard to this matter to confer with the Earl of Camperdown, it ought to be possible to discover some means of giving the House that information which the Lord President himself admits should not be withheld from the House.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, I confess that I think it would be very far from easy to give the information suggested by the noble Lord opposite. It is essential that any information given to the House by its officers should be perfectly accurate, and, especially as regards what passes in Grand Committee, that might be extremely difficult. But I have another objection to the Motion. I doubt whether it is wise that one House of Parliament should criticise or interfere with the mode in which the other House conducts its business. I think it is a matter altogether without precedent. I do not recollect that it has ever been done before, and I doubt whether it would be an advisable thing for this House to initiate an example that might be followed. The sound constitutional view of the subject is, I believe, that each House should be accountable for the manner in which it conducts its business, and I venture to think your Lordships would be entering upon a rather difficult course if you were to adopt the Motion of the noble Earl.

EARL CAWDOR: My Lords, I venture to think that the noble Marquess who has just sat down hardly appreciates what we are asking for. The proposal is not to discuss or criticise the action taken in the other House. What we are anxious to know is whether there were certain parts of certain Bills that had received no discussion at all in another place. I think it is straining the matter very far indeed to suggest that, in asking for that information, we are trenching on the prerogatives of another place.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, in a case where the closure had been applied after five or six hours discussion it would appear in the print asked for that there had been a closure; but the matter might have been fully discussed. The guillotine might be applied in Committee, and yet ample discussion allowed on Report. I would suggest that the Motion should be limited so as to show where there had been no discussion at all.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, I hope your Lordships' will insist on the Motion. The noble Marquess opposite spoke of this being an unprecedented action. The situation, so far as I know, is absolutely unprecedented. It is no exaggeration to say that freedom of speech has, to a great extent, been suppressed in another place, and it is important that we should have actually placed before us, in black and white, information as to what portions of Bills have not received any discussion at all.

*The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Lord Tweedmouth): My Lords, I would remind noble Lords opposite that they have ready to hand a very fair and full account of all that takes place in the other House in *Hansard*, and an idea as to the amount of discussion which any proposal had received could be better obtained from *Hansard* than in the way suggested by the noble Earl. We all know that a large number of Members in the other House who are opposed to a Bill waste time by discussing very immaterial points at great length instead of concentrating their attention on matters that are of importance. It is therefore largely their own fault if they do not have an opportunity of discussing the more important points.

Viscount MIDLETON: My Lords, in referring to the means we now have of estimating the discussions in the other House the noble Lord has forgotten that there is no report as to what takes place in Grand Committee. I think it is very necessary that we should know whether there are certain portions of Bills which have received no discussion at all.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY: My Lords, I think it is quite clear that by the acceptance of the Motion you would be converting impartial official Papers into Party pamphlets. It is quite obvious that the information sought is wanted for the sake of basing an argument. I remember that when Mr. Gladstone forced his Home Rule Bill through the other House there was no more effective pamphlet issued than the one showing in red ink the portions of that measure which were passed without consideration. There are plenty of organisations prepared to furnish you with the information desired without interfering with the dignity or impartiality of your official documents. In the first place, if the point is of any importance all your Lordships know it; secondly, if you do not know it there are plenty of people who will take care to tell you. I am quite certain that the Motion, if carried, would be the occasion of strife between the two Houses. There are already plenty of opportunities for strife between the two Houses; and there are likely to be more in a short time; and it would be unwise for your Lordships to begin the strife by turning your official documents into Party pamphlets.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: I have no desire to flaunt my Motion as a Party thing in the face of the House of Commons. I put it down solely with a view to obtaining information, and I fail to understand why the other House should feel annoyed by any step your Lordships might take in order to obtain information for yourselves. We are not in any way dealing with the procedure of the House of Commons. The noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty said that the Unionists in the House of Commons wasted a great deal of time, and that if they acted otherwise things would be different. But that has nothing whatever to do with this Motion. What I want is, if possible, to obtain information for this House with regard to points which have been passed over, either without any consideration whatever, or with very insufficient consideration; and Grand Committee is the stage in which it appears to me that the consideration has most undoubtedly been the smallest. There is no closure by compartments, so far as I have been able to ascertain, in Grand Committee, but this has happened very frequently—that a considerable portion of a clause has been closured, a number of Amendments being passed over without any consideration or debate whatever. In a case of that sort when the Bill comes up to your Lordships' House I think it is only right that we should have some means of knowing what the clauses are which have not been considered. As we know, there is no record at all of what happens in Grand Committee, to which nearly all important Bills now go. I put this Motion down with the view of obtaining information on these points. I do not attach any particular value to the terms of the Motion, and I see that it is open to some of the objections which have been raised. I do not, therefore, intend to press it in its present form, provided I can obtain some assurance on the matter from His Majesty's Government. If the request is limited to such cases as those which I have mentioned, will the Government be willing to join with me in drawing up a Motion which will give that information to the House? It seems to me that that is a very fair offer, and I should like to know what the Government have to say to it.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, I think it would be most undesirable that the House of Lords should institute an inquiry as to the way work is done in the other House.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: That is not my object.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: No matter what object the noble Earl has in view, his Motion would be regarded as the institution of an inquiry by your Lordships into the character of the consideration which the other House gives to Bills. That, of course, opens up at once the possibility of a reciprocal inquiry. I ask your Lordships what would be your feeling if a Motion were moved elsewhere for an inquiry as to the number of Peers present when a particular Bill was read a second time; as to the amount of time spent over that Bill; indeed, as to the degree of labour bestowed by your Lordships upon Bills. In the absence of much more serious argument, I would strongly deprecate such an inquiry as that proposed by the noble Earl. I would point out, further, that materials do not exist, so far as I know, for making any such Return, and the Motion, if carried, would lead to most extraordinary results. The noble Earl wishes to have information as to the application of the closure in the consideration of Bills. I believe such a thing has happened more than once as the Second Reading of a Bill having been closured. Therefore you would begin with a bracket which would include the whole Bill. Then the Bill is sent to Grand Committee, and there is no record of what happens there; and in regard to Committees of the Whole House, I believe I am right in saying that there is no record unless a division takes place on the question of the closure. If there is no division the Motion for the closure is not recorded, and you would be unable, by searching the records of the House, to find out what had happened. But supposing you had got all this information, there is the further stage of Report. You would therefore have closure upon closure, one bracket on the top of another, and then the Third Reading might be passed by means of the closure. I submit that the step proposed by the noble Earl should only be taken after grave consideration.

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, as I do not agree with the opinions which have been expressed by my noble friends on this side of the House I think it right to say so. I think that if the Motion were carried, however pure your Lordships' intentions might be, your action would be regarded as an inquisition into the methods of business of the other House, and as such it would surely be resented. It is perfectly open to us to obtain the clerical assistance required in other ways, and I hope your Lordships will pause before assenting to this Motion

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Might I ask whether the Government will accept a modified form of my Motion?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: In reply to the noble Earl, I think he will agree that it is scarcely reasonable to ask us to assent to a Motion until we see its exact terms. If the noble Earl will evolve something and put it on the Paper we will, of course, give it the most careful consideration.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Having heard that statement I will withdraw my Motion on this occasion, reserving to myself the right to bring it forward in a modified form later.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

THE CONGO FREE STATE.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the government of the Congo, and to move for Papers. This Motion concerns the lives and liberties of 15,000,000 human beings. I wish, therefore, that it had been placed in stronger hands. I appealed to the most rev. Primate himself to bring forward a Resolution on the Congo, but his Grace wished me to do it myself. This subject of the Congo is a most unpleasant and perplexing one, and I am not in the least surprised that every Government should as far as possible wish to leave it alone.

But, my Lords, it cannot be left alone. It is exciting intense interest among the people of this country at the present time. During the past few months forty-five town meetings, presided over in each case by the mayor, and numbers of meetings in counties, attended by Anglican Bishops, Roman Catholic priests, Nonconformist ministers, and politicians of all Parties, have been held to consider the state of affairs in the Congo. In my capacity as President of the Congo Reform Association it has been my duty to attend a very large number of these meetings, and I can say that the agitation is only beginning, for Congo reformers have not yet succeeded in reaching the mass of the people. Those who attend these meetings and hear the case presented are filled with surprise, as well as shame, horror, and indignation.

The story that we are putting before the people of England is this. We say that sovereign rights were granted to what was supposed to be a philanthropic enterprise, but which has since been transformed into a powerful engine of greed and oppression. We say that those rights were granted subject to certain limitations and conditions, every one of which has been insolently and impudently violated. We say that the Congo government has been one great act of spoliation of the natives from beginning to end. We say, further, that natives have been robbed of their land and its produce, and have been condemned to forced labour throughout vast regions, lasting nearly the whole of their time, and giving them no opportunity of earning their own livelihood. Not only are the male natives condemned to forced labour, but their wives and families are also similarly condemned in many places. Moreover, the natives have absolutely no enforcible rights of any sort or kind, and a great many of them live in abject terror, misery, and destitution. The Congo system could not have been better put than in the few words used by the noble Marquess opposite. Referring to the official reports alone, the noble Marquess said—

> "The official reports show bondage under the most barbarous and inhuman conditions, and maintained for mercenary motives of the most selfish character."

That is the Congo system of government which has been denounced by every British statesman who has had occasion to say anything about it, and that system has been enforced as it could only be enforced by the lash and the bullet, by murder and by torture.

The Congo system of government is a system of terrorism throughout, a system that is carried out by 40,000 black troops, mostly cannibals of the most savage description, who are under the Congo officials. The duties of these troops is to force men to get rubber and women to provide supplies. I need scarcely say that they do a great deal beyond that. Your Lordships can easily understand what goes on when a village is looted by these ruffians, who are armed with weapons of precision against the bows and arrows of the natives. There is one instrument of Congo government which is most diabolically ingeniously adapted to its end, which is the enforcement of forced labour. I refer to the hostage houses. When I heard them described by a missionary who had seen these houses I was deeply moved. The system of hostage houses is this. The black troops naturally find some difficulty in pursuing black men into the Congo forest. They elude their vigilance, and so the black troops go to a village, seize every man, woman, and child they can lay their hands on, and herd them together in one of these hostage houses, where they are tied together and kept in the most filthy condition. They very often starve them, sometimes to death. One missionary who had entered one of these houses described the insanitary and horrible condition of the place. He mentioned that he saw a young woman on the floor and he said to her, "What is the matter with you? Are you ill?" "No, white man," she said, "I am not ill, but I am dying of starvation. Two days ago I gave birth to a child, and have had nothing to eat ever since." There are two persons who are especially interested, or, at all events, who especially interest themselves, in this question of Congo reform—Mr. and Mrs. Harris. Mr. Harris was a missionary for a long time in the Congo, and he has addressed literally hundreds of meetings with Mrs. Harris. His energy is only equal to that of Mr. Morel. I mention Mr. Harris not only because he has made more speeches than anybody else on this subject, but because he and Mrs. Harris are well known—and very favourably known—both to the noble Lord the Under-Secretary and to the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Harris has got hold of some interesting relics. He has obtained from the village chiefs round his mission 1,000 twigs, every one of which represents a murder by a black soldier, for the way in which these chiefs keep count is by breaking off a twig for every murder and keeping it in some place where it will be safe.

Having explained to the best of our ability to the people of this country what the system is and how it is maintained and enforced, we go on to show them what the responsibility of this country is in the matter. We tell them that England is responsible, in the first place, as one of the signatories of the Berlin Act of 1885 which handed over the Congo to King Leopold. Article VI. of the Berlin Act pledged every one of the signatories to care for the preservation of the native races and for their moral and material advancement; and Sir Edward Malet, our Ambassador at Berlin, said that the Conference ought to take very great care how it dealt with the native question, for the natives were not represented at the Conference, and it—

> "makes the very greatest difference to them what provisions are laid down at this Conference with regard to the natives."

It has made absolutely no difference at all of any kind or sort to a single native. Talk of the preservation of the native races! Why we have it on the authority of Consul Casement, who knows the Congo thoroughly and who was there for seventeen years before he wrote his report, that there has been a depopulation in fifteen years of 3,000,000 people. When we remonstrate, we are told by King Leopold that it is not our business.

We further tell the people of England that this country has a special responsibility in the matter. It has this special responsibility, that had it not been for our determined action the King of the Belgians would not now be ruler over the Congo, but the King of Portugal. It was we who deliberately placed King Leopold on the throne of the Congo. There is one other country which equally shares that responsibility with us—the United States of America; and we are happy to say that the United States are heartily with us, and would back up England in any course she might think proper to take. That is the case we lay before the people of England, the case which is supported by a mass of official evidence both from English and Belgian sources, and when such a case as that is heard from eye-witnesses it makes a deep and lasting impression upon audiences. The country feels that the case for intervention is absolutely complete. It feels that it concerns the honour of England not to sit still and do nothing. Sometimes we are told that we ought to have patience. Do your Lordships know how long these atrocities have been going on? They have been continuing for the past fifteen years, ever since in 1892 King Leopold issued secret decrees granting bonuses in proportion to the rubber collected.

By every post there reaches the Foreign Office the evidence of the missionaries that these horrors are still going on. We have other evidence than that of the missionaries. There are the rubber statistics put forward by Belgium herself. The rubber taken from the Congo in 1906 was considerably greater than the amount in 1905. In 1905 the total was 5,716 tons; in 1906 it was 6,276 tons. Those are very significant figures. If in 1905, by all the efforts of the Congo Government, they were only able to get 5,716 tons, we have every reason to think that, whatever may happen in other parts of the Congo, in the depths of the Congo forest there is more cruelty brought to bear on the natives than in 1905. Further, we find from the White Paper on the Table of your Lordships' House, that the reform decrees put forward last year by King Leopold are ridiculed on the Congo and considered to be thoroughly illusory.

Take the case of Major Lemaire, who was for some time a Congo official. He was at one time high in favour with King Leopold and was appointed President of the Congo Boundary Commission. But lately he has been broken by King Leopold because he ventured to criticise the Congo system. He has now published his reminiscences, and I read in an English newspaper two or three days ago a statement by him that the Congo officials were determined to punish the native tribes, and the way in which they punished them was this. They asked these wretched savages to bring in supplies, and when they brought them in they were treacherously shot down. Major Lemaire says that that is not an uncommon practice on the Congo. I have never heard a missionary put forward as part of his case such treachery as that, and it only shows that nobody but a Congo official thoroughly understands the Congo system. This is the evidence of Major Lemaire of what took place four years ago when he was a Congo official, and before he discovered the full iniquity of the system. We are constantly told that there are no atrocities, because a good many people who have lived in the Congo for years have never seen anything of them. But these things are not done upon the housetops or in public; they are done in the recesses of the Congo forest; and if Major Lemaire was four years before he found out what was going on, it is natural that other people may live a long time there before finding out. Major Lemaire insisted on the return of bribes paid to the *Petit Bleu* by Congo officials. Therefore it is no wonder that he was broken by King Leopold.

I will now mention to your Lordships what has been said by English statesmen of the first rank on both sides with regard to this question. As long ago as June, 1904, Sir Edward Grey said that the honour of all Europe was concerned not to sit still and do nothing. Now, one would imagine from that expression on the part of Sir Edward Grey that the noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, who was then Foreign Minister, had stood still and done nothing. But that was not the case. In June, 1904, the situation was this. The noble Marquess had tried to do a great deal and had managed to accomplish something. In 1903 he tried to call a Conference of the Powers, but they refused his invitation. Failing that, the noble Marquess sent Consul Casement to find out what was going on in the Congo, and his Report opened the eyes of the people of this country when it was published early in 1904. Not only had the noble Marquess done that, but before Sir Edward Grey's statement in the House of Commons the noble Marquess had extracted a promise from King Leopold that he would himself send a Commission of Inquiry to the Congo. He did send this Commission of Inquiry, and the result confirmed Consul Casement's statements. But, although that was the Report of King Leopold's Commission of Inquiry, we have not had the evidence upon which it was based. The evidence has never been published; but we know from the case of Mr. Stannard, the missionary who was fined for libelling a Congo official, that part of the evidence that was heard before the Commission was never taken down. We also know from Mr. and Mrs. Harris, who were also present, that much of the evidence which was tendered was refused. The attitude that Mr. Harris took up before the Commission of Inquiry was this: He said to the President of the Commission—

> "I have been told that I am guilty of exaggerating these Congo atrocities. You must either hear every witness I bring before you, or you must acknowledge that I have not exaggerated."

Mr. Harris brought canoe load after canoe load of witnesses, and at last the President said—

> "We are perfectly satisfied that what you said is true."

The situation in June, 1904, was this, that Lord Landsdowne had tried to call a European Conference, that he had obtained a most valuable Report from Consul Casement and was in the course of obtaining most valuable information from King Leopold's own Commission of Inquiry. But in June, 1904, Sir Edward Grey was not satisfied with what the noble Marquess had done. Now after three years—and in the course of these three years we have the Belgian evidence, as well as our own, of these atrocities—Sir Edward Grey is content to wait an indefinite period. But if Sir Edward Grey was not then satisfied with the action or inaction of the noble Marquess, what shall we say of the noble Lord the Under-Secretary? My noble friend Lord Fitzmaurice was much more dissatisfied with the action of the noble Marquess and proclaimed—I think perfectly rightly—that the Congo State had forfeited the right to be considered a civilised State, and the noble Lord was in favour of despatching a warship to Boma. He impressed upon the Government of the day that they should at once appoint Consuls with consular jurisdiction.

A year ago the tables were turned. The noble Marquess opposite had given up the trammels of office and the noble Lord the present Under-Secretary returned to the Foreign Office. The noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, freed from office, pressed for consular jurisdiction, which he had opposed; and the noble Lord, Lord Fitzmaurice, when in office was converted to the policy of patience. While these Front Bench amenities are going on the Congo natives are being killed, starved, and tortured by the thousand. It is said that King Leopold has issued certain decrees. In June last year he issued a new law which can scarcely be called a reform. He promulgated a law making calumnious denunciation of the general method of government in the Congo subject to a penalty of five years' imprisonment, and five years' imprisonment to a white man in the Congo means a sentence of death. It is monstrous that we should still allow our missionaries and other British subjects to be liable to Congo justice under such a law. If we do not at once insist on consular jurisdiction we might at any rate send more Consuls to the Congo, and we might give them means of communication of their own. We are not quite so helpless as perhaps some people think. If we chose to do so we could, by methods that are well known to His Majesty's Government, though they may not think it wise to refer to them, make the government of the Congo State extremely difficult.

Then we come to the debate of 15th May last, in the House of Commons. The Secretary of State said on that occasion—

> "We must concentrate on a change of system in the Congo."

We all agree. But the Secretary of State added—

> "We must wait a reasonable time to know the terms on which Belgium will agree to annexation."

This statement of indefinite delay confirms King Leopold in his opinion that we do not mean business. The Secretary of State fears he will embarrass the reform party if he says anything about intervention at the present moment. But is it not a greater danger to say nothing and encourage King Leopold to think there is no limit to our patience? King Leopold is not in the least conciliated by Sir Edward Grey's amiable sentiments about Belgium, and the Leopold Press sneers and laughs at our Secretary of State. Our contention with regard to our rights is perfectly plain and has been constantly stated. The Secretary of State said on 19th February last, that—

> "King Leopold can only transfer to Belgium such rights as he himself possesses. That is a clear proposition of law. Belgium can only take over the Congo subject to the conditions and limitations of the Berlin Act."

That declaration was not the first that had been made by Sir Edward Grey or the noble Marquess in the same sense. It only confirmed previous declarations. Sir Edward Grey confirmed last March the position taken by Lord Lansdowne in the Despatch to Belgium of August, 1903. He said that—

> "England cannot asquiesce in a system that robs the native of his property. The native must be free to buy and sell the produce of the land."

These propositions have been so clearly laid down, both by Sir Edward Grey and Lord Lansdowne, that I do not quarrel with the Secretary of State for not repeating them on every occasion. We wish to believe that annexation by Belgium means a complete change in the Congo system. No doubt the Secretary of State may consider that it is only unnecessarily offensive to Belgium to be always emphasising what our rights are, should she annex and fail in her duty. But as the Belgian Press has chosen to assume, from Sir Edward Grey's silence on 15th May, that his position with regard to the Berlin Act has weakened, I say it is now absolutely necessary that we should have an explicit declaration, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, that the Secretary of State still stands, and always will stand, by our rights under the Berlin Act, rights which have never been doubted by any English statesman.

Now there is another great question, whether or not England should take isolated action in the matter. Sir

Edward Grey has never been explicit on that vital question, and he never was less explicit on it than on 15th May last. What he then said, in substance, was that should the Belgian solution fail the question becomes an international question. No doubt it becomes an international question, but it is also a national question, and England is not in the mood to shirk her responsibility simply because others shirk theirs. I hope the noble Lord the Under-Secretary will say that England is prepared to act alone, if necessary, and will maintain her anti-slavery and humanitarian pre-eminence. I am afraid the omens of the settlement of this question by Belgium are unfavourable. Only a few days ago we had put before us the names of eight gentlemen who had been appointed to draft a Bill of Annexation for the Belgian Parliament. Every one of these eight gentlemen, with possibly one exception, is a devoted adherent of the Congo system. With regard to Papers, the Papers on the Table are six months out of date. Our Consuls in those Papers declare the futility of the paper reforms promulgated by King Leopold, and they say the reform decrees are accompanied by secret instructions which our Consuls are not allowed to see. Vice-Consul Armstrong says that forced labour is still exacted to an extent leaving natives no time to earn a living wage. He says—

> "In visiting rubber working towns one would expect to see some signs of European commodities that had been given in exchange for the millions of pounds' worth of rubber which have been extracted from them, but the native residents possess actually nothing at all."

Can you wonder that under such circumstances the natives are desperate? Can you wonder that there is martial law in the A.B.I.R. I want Papers up to date. I want the country to know what the Consuls say to the latest missionary reports of atrocities. I have said that I hope the Secretary of State will declare for isolated action if the co-signatories will not join. But the greatest responsibility rests on the people, not on Ministers. Ministers are the servants and not the masters of the people. The people of England are day by day issuing their instructions to Sir Edward Grey with more emphasis. They say that this great Congo iniquity must cease, and that, if drastic action to that end is necessary, drastic action must be taken and taken soon.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the administration of the Congo Free State."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, this is a discussion in which no man with a spark of feeling finds it otherwise than painful to take part. It is one of the most disheartening and one of the most humiliating of contemporary questions, and yet it is simply impossible for us to let it alone. The urgency of the matter is constantly growing in intensity; and I do not think the public, horror stricken as it is at the account of these atrocities, has fully realised what some of those who are most competent to speak regard as the gravity of the case, not for the Congo alone, but for the whole of Africa. Sir Harry Johnston, in a memorable letter, has written—

> "Unless some stop can be put to the misgovernment of the Congo regions I venture to warn those who are interested in African politics that a movement is already begun, and is spreading fast, which will unite the negroes against the white race, a movement which will prematurely stamp out the beginnings of the new civilisation we are trying to implant, and against which movement, except so far as the actual coast line is concerned, the resources of men and money, which Europe can put into the field will be powerless."

Those are words which show the significance of this matter beyond even the wide limits of the Congo State. The subject bristles with diplomatic perplexities, and for that reason the attention of the public has been concentrated rather on particular stories of horrible outrage and atrocity, and the larger issues of the problem have been left more or less in purely official hands. There seems to me to be a real danger that we may thus be led to forget the far larger issues involved in misgovernment in such a State and on such a scale.

What plain people, outside the intricacies of diplomacy, understand to be the story of recent years is this. Public attention was first directed in the "seventies" to a huge region of Central Africa—as large as Central Europe—the fertile nature of which had been until then unknown. The journeys of Lovett Cameron, and Sir H. Stanley brought the matter before Europe, and the European peoples determined to open up the region which Sir H. Stanley had described in such glowing terms. No doubt philanthropists were interested more or less in this region and its inhabitants; but it was mostly with commercial aims that the International Association was set on foot. If we study the record of the international discussions which took place, beginning with that between us and the United States of America, then the Anglo-Portuguese Treaty, first adopted by us and then dropped, and subsequently what was first called the International African Association, and afterwards became the Congo Free State, we find that, so far as this country was concerned, it was from the first made, in a most emphatic manner, an absolute condition of our concurrence that the real and permanent well-being of the natives should be promoted. These instructions were given by Lord Granville to our representatives at the Berlin Conference—

> "The principle which will command the sympathy and support of Her Majesty's Government will be that of the advancement of legitimate commerce, with security for the equality of treatment of all nations, and for the well-being of the native races."

That principle was embodied in Article VI. of the Convention, and the Powers bound themselves to—

> "watch over the preservation of the native tribes, and to care for the improvement of the condition of their moral and material well-being, and to help in suppressing slavery, and especially the slave trade."

We were a party to the agreement of which that was the essential element, and from that condition neither we nor the other Powers have a right to withdraw.

I do not know whether your Lordships remember what happened in 1884 and 1885, how this was hailed by the people as a philanthropic enterprise and almost as the dawn of a new era for African colonisation. The Lord Mayor went to Brussels to congratulate the King of the Belgians upon the splendid lead which he was giving to the philanthropy of Europe and the world. These were his words—

> "Deeply interested as is the City of London in all that concerns the progress of religious, humane, and commercial principles, and in the suppression of slavery and the slave trade, we the Corporation of that City, recognise in the enlightened, philanthropic, and disinterested efforts of your Majesty, and the bloodless victory wrought thereby, a triumph far grander than the greatest achievements of the sword."

There is a ghastly irony in even reading those words. It is absolutely impossible for any impartial man to read the official statements upon the management of the Congo State to-day without seeing that these conditions are preposterously contradicted. I do not refer to the reports of the missionaries, although the debt we owe these brave men for having brought to light facts which otherwise would have been unrevealed has not yet been adequately recognised. I confine myself to official statements, such for example as the Report of Consul Casement and Lord Cromer's comments upon it. No one can look at the official records without seeing that every condition that was laid down at the start has been grossly and flagrantly violated to-day. If these conditions are being broken, it seems to me that we are not only able but we are bound to move, if we regard with any reality at all the responsibility into which we have deliberately entered. No one has spoken more strongly on the subject than those who represent the Foreign Office on either side. Lord Fitzmaurice, speaking in the House of Commons in 1904, said—

> "He ventured to assert that the Congo Free State . . . . was as much the creation of European law as any corporation in this country which might be created under an Act of Parliament was the artificial creation of English law. Without the Berlin Conference there would be no Congo Free State; and if the reasons which induced Europe to consent to the formation of the Congo Free State failed, and if the conditions of that international contract were not fulfilled, and especially were not fulfilled by the beneficiary of that contract, then, at any moment, Europe, which called the Congo Free State into existence, was entitled to dissolve that State."

Sir Edward Grey used words which were stronger, and, in one sense, more emphatic. He said that the Congo State—

> "was really created by a sort of self-denying ordinance on the part of the various great Powers; but he would put it higher than that, he believed that many of them sanctioned it by a really generous impulse, to see civilisation spread. That that should have led to the state of things which they had heard recounted ought to be intolerable to the Powers which sanctioned it."

When we look into the facts, it seems to me that the mischief which finds its worst development in the horrible outrages is really fundamental in the manner in which the government of the State is carried on. The mutilations, the cruelties, the "hostage" system—these are simply appalling. But we mislead both ourselves and other people if we dwell too exclusively upon them. Those are the natural and inevitable outcome of a system which is fundamentally bad, and which is contradictory to the very principles laid down in the Berlin Convention twenty years ago.

The land is governed, or rather utilised, now, not for the good of its inhabitants—that is, not for the reasons for which the State was allowed to come into existence—but for the gain or profit of its so-called owners in Europe. The outrages done by the native soldiers are simply due to the necessities imposed upon them by their European masters of, *coûte que coûte*, producing the rubber, which becomes scarcer week by week. Mr. Pickersgill, who was British Consul in 1898, said:—

> "A sentry on the Congo is a dare-devil aboriginal chosen from troops impressed outside the district in which he serves, for his loyalty and force of character. Armed with a rifle and pouch of cartridges, he is located in a native village to see that the labour for which its inhabitants are responsible is duly attended to."

The whole system and object is that simply of gain for the European owners, as they call themselves, and not for the advantage and civilisation of the natives on whose behalf we made ourselves a party to the formation of that State. It is right in the teeth of the Convention of twenty years ago and of our own frequent declarations. Earl Percy, who was at that time Under-Secretary, said in June 1904:—

> "Our complaint is not that white men in the midst of a black population occasionally commit abominable atrocities, but that they are enabled to commit them, and in most cases with perfect impunity, by the fact that the Government itself invests them with irresponsible authority, that it exercises no adequate supervision over them, and that in many cases there is no readily accessible tribunal before which they can be brought. . . . When the United States first, and the European Government subsequently, recognised the existence in the Congo Basin of a Government possessed of a national *status*, that recognition was accorded, not to the Congo State, but to an association professing an international character, and proclaiming before the world as the object of its being, not the accumulation of rubber at an infinite cost of human life and suffering, but the protection and civilisation of the natives of Africa."

Nothing could add to the force of those words. The system that goes on in the Congo State contrasts not in degree, but in kind with the system of government pursued by any other Power in any other part of Africa which is now under its protectorate or control. Some things on these lines were done, I am afraid, by many of the European Powers 300 or 350 years ago. England's hands, perhaps, 300 years ago were by no means clean. But if it is horrible to read of those things occurring then, to read of them in contemporary history is not only horrible but intolerable. These are not my views, uninformed as I must necessarily be about a vast number of details. The contrast between the way in which the Congo State is governed and the way in which any other State in Africa under European control is governed is immeasurable. Sir Harry Johnston, that real expert in African matters, says—

> "The Crown lands, the control of which is assumed by the British Government, or by the Government of any civilised State in Africa, are—or should be—administered first and foremost in the interest of the community in which they are situated. For example, revenue derived from the Crown lands in British Central Africa or in Uganda goes to meet the cost of the administration of those countries and the maintenance of law and order therein, of the construction of public works, the prevention of disease, the improvement of communications, the advancement of education. The utmost gain to us that is derived from this administration of State monopolies is the easing of the pocket of the British tax-payer. . . . But the Crown lands, the public forests, the natural resources of the Congo Free State, instead of being administered as a national fund for the maintenance and improvement of that State, and the promotion of the welfare of its inhabitants, are actually diverted to the private profit of King Leopold and some of his associates. It is this that is the inherently false principle in the scheme of the Congo Free State."

That is a point which, I think, wants bringing home to people now. I have based my remarks largely upon quotations, because I wished to put the case in the words of those best qualified to speak.

The facts are only too fully admitted by everybody. In the last debate in the House of Commons on the subject Sir

Edward Grey spoke of the "gruesome unanimity" with which we all regarded it. Well, that is a unanimity which ought to lead to something more than grumbling and complaining, than acquiescing in delay. We desire that the Government should be reminded again and again that behind it stand the British people and that the British people do care about the matter from the bottom of their hearts; and we, representing the British people—not the officials, nor the diplomatists, whose task it is to give effect to the will of the British people—do believe that it ought to be possible now in some practical and real sense to take some step forward in regard to this terrible matter.

LORD CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH: My Lords, I think there will be complete unanimity in this House that some change in the Congo system is necessary. No cause, however just or however good, gained anything by refusing to acknowledge what was to be said on the other side, and in entering upon this question we must not forget that we owe a great deal to the King of the Belgians, inasmuch as he, when international difficulties stood in the way, came forward and at his own expense, and in large measure by his own energy, started the government in a hitherto ungoverned country; and during the last twenty years there have been established there over 300 trading posts and many kilometres of railway, and, above all, there has been abolished the system of slavery and of slave trading which carried with it atrocities and cruelties compared with which probably those laid to the charge of the Congo Government are comparatively small. The Government has been carried on with almost complete abolition of the traffic in spirits, which, among all savage races, has had so fearful and degrading an effect. In addition to that there has been established under the Government numerous missionary stations, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, which have done incalculable good in reclaiming the inhabitants from barbarism. Great efforts, too, have been made in extinguishing smallpox, and in dealing more or less effectively with the great curse of the country—the sleeping sickness. But, when we have admitted all this, I think we are bound to admit that the system of the Congo Government as carried on is one which is utterly and absolutely impossible and needs immediate and complete reversal. We have heard with horror tales of atrocities and crimes, and I was much struck, in reading a pamphlet entitled "Truth about the Congo," to find how much of that pamphlet was devoted to raking up more or less authentic cases of cruelty and mis-government which have occurred under our own rule. No one knows so well as ourselves the demoralising effect of living in an unhealthy country under circumstances of isolation from European influence and among a savage and degraded race. Is it, therefore, surprising that in the earlier history of the Congo many regrettable things were done? Here you have a territory which has no mother country to watch over it and no trained administrators, a country given over absolutely and bodily to what is called a State. I have always been at a loss to understand in what way the Congo State was really a State, except that, at the head of it, there was a King. What, in point of fact, it has always appeared to me to be was a chartered company with an international charter, and I maintain that those who gave that international charter have a right to demand an account of the way in which that charter is carried out, and, in the ultimate resort, to revoke it and reconstitute the Government of the country. The system of a chartered company governing a large State like the Congo, containing some 3,000 Europeans of various nationalities and some 15,000,000 inhabitants, with no public opinion to guide and criticise it, must inevitably lead to abuses such as those which have occurred in the Congo State. The system of government which is apparently accepted in the Congo is evidenced by the Commission that was sent out to inquire into the alleged abuses. These are their words—

> "It is only by making work obligatory that we can induce the native to give regular work and that we can obtain sufficient manual labour; and the only legal means at the disposal of the State to oblige the population to work is to impose a tax."

We are told, on the authority of the Commission, that the tax is fixed by the agents themselves at whatever they conceive reasonable or necessary, and although labour has in the last few years been restricted to some forty hours in the course of the month, there is every reason to believe that this limit is but very vaguely adhered to. How is the ignorant native to discriminate and to decide whether the armed forces of the State which compel him to work are compelling him to work to pay a tax to raise revenue for the State or for the benefit of a private company? What I think the people of this country demand of the Government is that they shall carry out the policy foreshadowed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in his speech on 15th May, when he said—

> "Our policy was that the Belgian Government should at once pass a Bill taking over the Congo State under conditions which would give the Belgian Parliament real power to improve the administration."

If that "real power" is to be anything more than an empty phrase, it must mean sweeping away the present system of government of the Congo State, not for the benefit of private individuals, but for the benefit of the State and the interest of the natives.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, having been on the Congo myself many years ago I desire to support the Motion of Lord Monkswell. When I was on that river it was at the time that Portugal was laying claims to its trade and navigation. I remember providing the late Mr. Jacob Bright with the information and material to aid him in combating those claims in the House of Commons. As matters have turned out I regret that England did not acquiesce to a certain extent in Portugal's claims, for I feel certain matters would have been better (at least) on the Upper Congo than at present. We on this side of the House are fully alive to what is going on, and desire as much as anyone to seek for a remedy of the existing state of affairs. On 8th August, 1903, my noble friend Lord Lansdowne, who was then Foreign Minister, sent a despatch to our representatives abroad, in the first paragraph of which he said—

> "The attention of His Majesty's Government has during recent years been repeatedly called to alleged cases of ill-treatment of natives and to the existence of trade monopolies in the Independent State of the Congo. Representations to this effect are to be found in memorials from philanthropic societies, in communications from commercial bodies, in the public Press, and in despatches from His Majesty's Consuls."

It is to the noble Marquess's credit—I say it in no Party spirit—that he first officially drew attention to the misrule on the Congo and lifted the veil that concealed the horrors and barbarities practised on the natives. The noble Marquess pointed out in that despatch that the system of trade existing in the Independent State of the Congo was not in harmony with the provisions of the Berlin Act. The despatch mentions three Articles of the Act, and I doubt if anyone would have the hardihood to contradict the statement that every one of those Articles has been disregarded and flouted in the most open manner.

Putting aside the humanitarian question altogether, Article I. of the Berlin Act provides that the trade of all nations shall enjoy freedom in the basin of the Congo. Article V. provides that no Power exercising sovereign rights in the Congo basin shall be allowed to grant therein a monopoly or favour of any kind in matters of trade. But with the exception of a relatively small area in the lower Congo, and the further exception of small plots held by natives, the whole territory is claimed as the private property either of the State or of the holders of land concessions. I am not going into a long account of the history of the Congo, but the person who began showing up by his writings the establishment of trade monopolies in the Congo was Mr. D. Morel. The English Government sent its Consul, Mr. Casement, an "African" of ability and experience, to make inquiries. He visited nearly all the concessionnaire territories in the Upper Congo where abuses were said to exist, and anyone reading his Report will see that every word in Lord Lansdowne's despatch was proved. Districts once densely populated have become almost depopulated, and cruelties have been committed too disgusting to mention. One would have thought this was proof enough. But no. Its accuracy was contested by the King of the Belgians and a certain section of the Belgian Press; after many delays His Majesty appointed a Commission to make an even more extended examination of the Congo Free State. His Commissioners were Belgian, Swiss, and Italian jurists. Everyone, of course, thought they were the nominees of the King, and that being his creatures they would deny Consul Casement's Report. On the contrary, these Commissioners gained the confidence of the natives and the respect and admiration of the missionaries. Their Report appeared on 30th October, 1905, and, even if a little toned down before publication, it was the most frank and damaging indictment of the Congo Free State methods that could have appeared from an official source. Let it be noted that the witnesses' evidence has never been published.

What has been done? A White Paper was published in April last showing that a series of new decrees, embodying the recommendations of the Reform Commission, had been promulgated and that they had been sanctioned by the King of the Belgians. Judging from reports in this White Paper [Cd. 3450] from our consuls and missionaries, it is doubtful if those reforms have been carried out; but in fairness I feel bound to state that there has been some improvement. My noble friend Lord Hindlip, who was here on Monday when the debate was expected to come on but is now on his way to Canada, has asked me to submit his views in that direction to your Lordships. In his letter to me he begins by calling attention to the fact that on page 1 of the Report Mr. Mitchell, our Consul, says—

> "Political conditions are satisfactory,"

and that on page 25 he states—

> "In the Lindi district some seven or eight tons of rubber used to be collected monthly, whereas now only one ton is collected."

Lord Hindlip says Mr. Mitchell does not know why the pressure has been thus taken off. He only says, answering the complaint *re* boatmen and carriers, that he obtained them without difficulty. On page 26 Mr. Mitchell pays a tribute to the—

> "industry and good conduct of nearly all the State agents I have met."

In his letter to me Lord Hindlip continues:—

> "Mr. Armstrong reports that the A.B.I.R. zone is very bad; but at the end of his Report, on page 37, he says that 'the judicial officers now appear anxious and willing to put a stop to the abuses of the past.' The old sentry system, personally, I should consider very dangerous, but Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Armstrong appear to disagree. The latter considers it a mistake, the former seems to agree with Monsieur Henri, who says he is in favour of it, and gives his reasons. Apparently these sentries are being replaced by practically unarmed messengers, and I am told by an acquaintance that no soldier is allowed out with his rifle, but I do not know, of course, if this is correct. The iniquitous system of armed capitas for tax collecting purposes is done away with. Mr. Mitchell states that in the Aruwimi districts the tax of rubber appears to be moderate; and, personally, as far as I can see, the rate of wages where paid compares favourably with the rates in other countries. On page 60, Mr. Mitchell says: 'Strangely enough . . . . . difficulty.' Also on page 29 at the top—'Workmen on the line . . . . striking.' On page 49, Mr. Mitchell states—'It is only due to the general integrity and fairness of the local officials that the natives get any justice at all.' He complains that there are no pleaders to represent black complainants or prisoners, but I think that this is a universal complaint, not only in Africa. Dr. Wollaston, in a discussion after a lecture at the Royal Geographical Society a short time ago, speaking of his recent experiences in the Congo, said that the Congo is not so black as it is painted. He was leader of the British Museum expedition to the Rewenzori district. I have no wish to defend the Congo, and certainly not the King of the Belgians, but the official correspondence and travellers' reports make me think that the case against the Congo is apt to be exaggerated. I do not know whether you saw the letter in the *Spectator* a month or six weeks ago from Bishop Tucker, of Uganda, in which he draws a harrowing picture of slavery in Zanzibar and Mombasa. As a matter of fact, the slaves there are better off than their masters, and I believe it is a fact that there is at present a high caste Arab or Swahili working in a Government office in Zanzibar for the sole purpose of earning money to keep his slaves."

So much for Lord Hindlip's letter, but I must point out that under the decrees the hours of labour were to be reduced from sixty to forty; if there had been a reduction in the hours there would have been a diminution in the rubber export, whereas there has been no such diminution, and this was stated in the Belgian Parliament.

We have to look for another solution. The *Independence Belge* stated about the middle of last month that the Congo Annexation Bill would be laid before the Belgian Chamber, and that an extraordinary session would be held in October for this purpose. The people of this country are well aware of what has been going on, and is going on, in the Congo Free State. The Belgians also know it, and it must be clearly understood that if Belgium as a nation takes over the Congo Free State there must be a complete reversal of the present state of affairs, its principles and its claims. The annexation, if there is one, must be on the lines and in the terms of the Berlin Act. It is doubtful if annexation will be decided upon by the Belgian Chamber, for if Belgium took over the Congo I very much doubt if the present state of affairs would be allowed to continue, and, if altered for the better, there would be a decrease in the output of rubber and a corresponding decrease in revenue which the Belgian taxpayer would have to bear.

A suggestion has been made that the Powers who signed the Berlin Act should agree that there should be an increase in the import duties on the Congo, to recoup any losses Belgium would incur under an altered state of administration. I put forward that suggestion, and it is one that has been made before, as one way of getting out of the difficulty. But if Belgium does not annex we should invite another Conference of the Powers in the terms of Lord Lansdowne's despatch which holds good to-day as in 1903. In that despatch the noble Marquess said—

> "His Majesty's Government are of opinion that it is incumbent upon the Powers parties to the Berlin Act to confer together and to consider whether the obligations undertaken by the Congo State in regard to the natives have been fulfilled; and, if not, whether the Signatory Powers are not bound to make such representations as may secure the due observance of the provisions contained in the Act."

Surely that has more force now that proof upon proof has been given of misrule on the Congo. If there was a Conference it could bring into being the International Commission, which only requires the co-operation of five of the signatory Powers, and it could work on the lines of the Danube River Commission, which everyone said would be a failure, but which proved not to be so. With reference to this matter, I would quote the words of the present Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on 9th June, 1904. The noble Lord then said—

> "When the British Government accepted the International Commission they were not thinking of a River Commission in the mere technical sense of the term, but believed with the other Powers that an International Commission would be of great use in establishing on the Congo the flag of civilisation, and that a Commission of that kind on that river would be a sign to all those who lived in that part of the world that civilisation was on the river. He had always regretted that since that time no attempt had been made to establish an International Commission on the Congo. He ventured to say that the Government should take every step they could for the establishment of an International Commission on that river."

I wonder if the noble Lord is of the same opinion now. My noble friend Lord Fitzmaurice knows the Congo question by heart, for he was Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when the Congo Free State was called into existence.

Assuming that our representations to Belgium and the Powers fall through, what can we do? We can increase our Consuls in the Congo State, which we have a perfect right to do under our Treaty. I am perfectly certain that the state of affairs would then very soon change. This has been urged by the Foreign Secretary and by Lord Fitzmaurice in 1904 and 1905 and by Lord Lansdowne in 1906. All are agreed that we can exercise our rights in this respect. If the other Powers are jealous let them put Consuls there too—the more the better. We have even a right to put a gun-boat on the Upper Congo, which is an international highway like the Niger.

There is one more important matter which goes to the root of the whole question. It seems that during the inquiry of the Commissioners appointed by King Leopold the president pointed out to the director of the concessionnaire company that the right to force labour from the people did not exist in the title deeds of the company. Labour on the Congo has been translated into rubber; and if they cannot force labour from the people the whole system breaks down. I ask the noble Lord if he will give us an assurance that he will apply for and publish copies of these documents. If they are procured they will show the whole system to be illegal. I think the time has long passed for hesitation in this matter. While we are debating, the wretched natives are being bullied, tormented, and forced to labour, and King Leopold and the concessionnaire companies grow rich. Diplomacy and despatches regarding the Congo Free State have had their day, and if the Government choose to act the moment has now come. If England moves in the matter, I have no doubt the other Powers will not put hindrances in the way. We must take the lead; and it remains to be seen whether the Government have the courage of their opinions so often and so freely expressed.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK: My Lords, I think we are in danger of suffering from our own unity in this matter. If we could put a little "ginger" into the debate in the way of a suggestion of censure on the Foreign Office for its conduct in the matter, present or past, the benches would not be so empty as they are to-night. I think that has been illustrated by the two last speeches to which we have listened. We were anxious, after the very full and effective statement of the noble Lord below the gangway, to hear what would be said on the other side. We heard a rumour that there was a noble Lord who intended coming down to the House and attempting what appeared to us the very difficult task of defending the Congo administration; but the House is informed that the noble Lord in question is now crossing the ocean; and the noble Lord who has just sat down, while conveying in a chivalrous manner the message which his friend had given him to the effect that there was some improvement in the state of things on the Congo, was himself whole-heartedly in favour of action being taken to bring that state of things to an end.

It used also to be said that the agitation against the Congo is got up by Protestants, and that Roman Catholics are by no means of the same mind. But, whatever may be the case in Belgium, the Roman Catholics of England are with us in this, as was shown by the speech of the noble Lord opposite, Lord Clifford of Chudleigh, who threw the whole weight of his opinion on the same side. This is a subject on which it is difficult for anyone to claim the attention of the House. If we speak we seem to be labouring a cause which is proved up to the hilt, and if we keep silent we do an injustice both to ourselves and to those great sections of public opinion which we represent. I believe the noble Lord below the gangway was perfectly right in saying that this question is getting a strong hold upon the heart and mind of the country. He has attended meetings in all parts of the country. Outside my own region I have only attended one. It was a large meeting held in one of the great halls of Liverpool, and to see the intensity with which that meeting of strong and sturdy Englishmen took up all the points and demonstrated their indignation was an experience of a most moving kind.

This matter is free from any political or controversial consideration, and on that very ground it will, in the long run, produce a stronger force of public opinion. This is a matter where the moral forces are at issue with the material. I do not think we can measure the power that this scooping in of revenue on the part of the Sovereign of the Congo State gives to him. There is danger of influence behind the Press, of lobbying and suborning public opinion, and knowing how great those influences may be even in free countries, I am almost surprised that the overwhelming strength of this case should have forced itself as it has done on men of all parties in this country. We are, perhaps, and rightly, more reticent than our fathers in our reference to the stern justice of Almighty God by which in the end these things are governed. But it is not we who first introduced here that Sacred Name. At the head of the Berlin Act are the words, "In the name of Almighty God," and the contents of the Act are not unworthy of that august preface, including as they do professions of consideration for the native, care for the progress of civilisation, and all the splendid motives of philanthropy and goodness to which the international representatives then appealed. But even if we lower our hearts from that ultimate source of justice and its methods, we cannot help seeing how the penal consequences may work out. Sir Harry Johnston, who knows Africa better than most men, has told us that what is really at issue is the reputation of Europe and the reputation of England; and it is very easy to imagine how such deeds might engender in the souls of the native population of Africa the gravest forces of hatred and antagonism to the white man, and contempt for what his civilisation means, of which the future only can show the result.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, I am glad there has been in the course of this interesting debate almost a consensus of opinion in regard to the facts. It is true that Lord Clifford of Chudleigh mentioned some things which were to be said on behalf of the administration of the Congo Free State. They had constructed certain railways, had attempted to cope with the evils of the liquor traffic, and had taken a useful part in co-operating with other Powers to combat the gigantic evils of the sleeping sickness. But this rendered all the more striking the noble Lord's condemnation of the main features of the administration, evils which they have almost deliberately created for themselves by entirely disregarding the experience of other countries, painfully gained.

The old East India Company has been instanced. The century before last there were great struggles in both Houses in this country as to how far it was desirable to allow that company to be both a trading company and to hold administrative sway. And, as time went on, in each successive charter that was granted the administrative powers of the East India Company were more and more limited, and the government of India ultimately was entirely taken over by the Crown. Such was the experience by which this and other countries have been almost universally guided. But some years after the Berlin Conference the Congo Free State threw aside all the experience of the past and proceeded to introduce principles of government which were bound, by an almost fatal necessity, to bring them and the natives whom they governed into the terrible position in which they now stand at the bar of Europe.

The opinion of Sir Harry Johnston has often been alluded to in the course of these debates. Sir Harry Johnston is one of the first amongst living authorities on African government, if not, indeed, the highest; and in a letter which appeared in *The Times* the other day he gave his opinion as follows—

> "The kernel of the mischief on the Congo is that the natives' proprietary rights in and over their own country are absolutely ignored, are vested without any deed of cession or purchase in a foreign, far-distant absentee, a personage who has never seen the Congo and has long been selling the land of the people and the produce thereof over the heads of the inhabitants to other Europeans. It may be argued that, in constituting himself the sole owner or landlord of the vast Congo region, King Leopold intended to administer this country in a fiduciary capacity and for the benefit of the Congo people. But he has never published any accounts to show how he has acquitted himself in this capacity, or how he has expended the funds derived from the land and produce of the country entrusted to his supervision by Europe, a country of which he claims (except for the sites of villages and mission stations) to be the sole disposer. This inherently vicious system must not be handed over from the King-Sovereign to the Belgian nation."

That brings me to the present position of the question. Your Lordships are entitled to ask His Majesty's Government what progress they have made towards a solution of this question since the debates of last year. I may be permitted to make a friendly protest against its being thought that the attitude of His Majesty's Government has been one of comparative indifference. I do not think my noble friend who introduced this debate quite intended to convey that impression, nor do I think the noble Lord will on reflection stand by what he said in regard to the contrast between the utterances of Sir Edward Grey and myself in the House of Commons from the Front Opposition Bench in 1904 and our utterances since we came into office. I absolutely deny that what we then said was intended in any sense as a criticism of what was done by the noble Marquess opposite when he was head of the Foreign Office. Sir Edward Grey touched upon the question of Consular jurisdiction, and I personally spoke of the establishment of an International River Commission on the Congo. The noble Marquess by his action endorsed those opinions, and we have since followed upon the same lines. But we have never disguised from ourselves that there are grave difficulties arising from the fact that this is an international question, and, because we are entitled under European instruments to express an opinion, we are bound before we take any extreme action of our own to have exhausted every remedy which the international instruments before us furnish. If we were to plunge into sudden and unsupported action, I doubt whether the opinion of the people of this country would be with us, and, even if it were with us, we should run a risk in this delicate matter of doing an injury to the great cause of humanity by rash action and possible failure. I may remind the House that the Foreign Office under the noble Marquess opposite did issue a circular fully supported by the opinion of this country, but the replies received from the Powers to which that circular was addressed were not of the character which the noble Marquess or we could have hoped. In regard to the questions of the establishment of Consular jurisdiction and the River Commission, we must be careful that whatever proposals are placed before the Powers are proposals which have a reasonable hope of being adopted. One of the difficulties arises from the number of instruments which have to be considered. The separate treaties recognising the Congo Free State by the several Powers and the Act of the Berlin Conference are not the same, but separate documents. Therefore, we have to examine these documents most carefully so as to secure that any proposal we make shall be one to which no successful objection of a technical character can be made by any of the Powers. There is sometimes a tendency to forget that the establishment of a Consular Court only gives direct protection to foreign subjects. The establishment of the Consular Court would be a very insufficient thing by itself to bring good government into this most misgoverned region. Although I have for some years passed been active in pressing for the setting up of an international River Commission, I am not prepared to say that the establishment of such a Commission by itself would be sufficient to bring back good government to the Congo. Years ago I had the honour of being one of the British plenipotentiaries who negotiated the existing settlement in regard to the Danube, but it was never supposed that the River Commission was enough to restore good order and government in Bulgaria, and other and far larger measures had to be taken.

Public opinion here must not imagine that the Foreign Office has got under its own control some measures which could be put into force to-morrow to bring about the desired state of affairs. In the debate last year I stated that there was hope of this question being taken up by the Belgian Parliament. Since then, although progress has not been very rapid, progress has been made, and a Parliamentary Commission was appointed. A Ministerial crisis supervened, but we are told that in the course of the early autumn His Majesty's Government will be in possession of new proposals by the Belgian Government. Under these circumstances would it be wise that either I or Sir Edward Grey in another place should use language which, however carefully chosen, might possibly be misunderstood, and certainly would always be liable to misrepresentation, language which might be seized upón by the adversaries of the views which your Lordships unanimously hold, and thus endanger the very objects which we all have at heart?

I make no complaint that this is disappointing to my noble friend. I ask him to believe that I also am disappointed to have once more to make an appeal for time and patience. I make that appeal, not because these grievances are small. Perhaps nobody has been more active then myself for many years, both in the Government and in opposition, in attempting to get introduced a better condition of affairs in the Congo. I have been accused very freely in foreign newspapers of acting as I have done because I was opposed to the original constitution of the Congo State, and because I had most of the responsibility of the Anglo-Portugese Treaty. Be that as it may, I only allude to those events to show to those who are inclined to suggest that Sir Edward Grey and myself may be indifferent and too fond of caution and delay, that there are no people in the world less open to such a charge than we are. But while anxious to see a radical change brought about, we shall not allow our sympathies and feelings to carry us off our feet. The people of this country are entitled to say that the Government must choose the right means of obtaining the end which we desire; lest by hurried and perfunctory action we run the risk of some diplomatic rebuff and failure which might perhaps indefinitely put back the cause.

I have great confidence in the people and Parliament of Belgium. I think they will do the right thing because they desire the right object. They have before them the demands of civilisation, the voice of religion, the cry of common humanity, all united to implore them to do what is right. "Let right prevail"; that is all we ask. It is perhaps remarkable that the eyes of the civilised world should at this moment be centred upon the two neighbouring capitals, The Hague and Brussels. In the one a Conference is sitting from which it is hoped that great advantage will flow to the cause of peace; and in any case some limitations may be imposed upon the customs of war to the advantage of neutrals and the inhabitants of the countries even of belligerents. But the task of the Hague Conference is one concerned with a multitude of complicated questions. The very constitution of the Conference is one which necessarily leads to deliberation and possibly to delay. But the Parliament of Belgium is dealing with another question, as much concerned with the cause of civilisation as even the great Conference at The Hague; and their task, although it has its difficulties, is, compared at least with the work of The Hague Conference, one of comparative simplicity.

May we not hope that before the year is out both at The Hague Conference and also at Brussels, a great work will have been done for civilisation and for humanity? In any case, until I see it in black and white, I shall refuse to believe that the Belgian Parliament and the Belgian people will not do their duty in this matter. On behalf of the Foreign Office and of the Government I say that we believe in the sense of equity and justice of the Belgian people and in the wisdom of the Belgian Parliament; and we believe also that before the year is terminated, even if this question has not entered upon its final stage—and that perhaps would be hoping for too much—we shall be able to report that great and substantial progress has been made in the solution of this question and towards redressing the wrongs of those unhappy people who have found such eloquent advocates in your Lordships' House to-night.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, if I venture to add a few words to what has already been said on this subject, it is because I am afraid that if I remain silent my silence might be misunderstood, and I should regret that there should be any doubt as to the manner in which I regard the important subject which your Lordships have been discussing this evening. I have never shrunk from expressing frankly my views in regard to it, both in and out of Parliament, both by word of mouth and on paper.

I say at once that I do not yield to any of the noble Lords who have preceded me this evening in my profound dissatisfaction at the condition of things which prevails in the Congo Free State. The same odious system of terrorism continues. We have the same only too well-founded reports of the brutal treatment of the natives. We have the same forced labour, the same ignoring of the proprietary rights of the natives. All these things continue. And we have also that combination in the same persons of administration and trading which, as we all know, lends itself so much to the perpetration of these abuses. I, too, am greatly disappointed at the small progress which has been made in redressing these iniquities. We can perhaps, at any rate, say that more light has been let into this dark region, and I am extremely obliged to my noble friend Lord Monkswell for his reference to the efforts which I made in that direction during the time that I was responsible for the foreign affairs of this country. But the disease remains, and I think the most rev. Prelate was correct when he told us that what we had to deal with was, not the acts of brutality and cruelty which we constantly hear of, but the system of which these acts are the natural and inevitable outcome. It is the system itself which has to be changed before we shall cease to hear of these acts.

I read with great satisfaction the statement made the other day elsewhere by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and I took note in particular of a single expression which he used, and which seemed to me to sum up the case very aptly indeed. Sir Edward Grey said that what we wanted was "results, and not reforms." I hope we shall insist upon results. What, then, is the most promising mode of endeavouring to obtain those results? We have had various suggestions made to us this evening. One or two of the noble Lords who have spoken made no secret of their preference for what, I think, they described as drastic measures. One of them suggested a gunboat. A gunboat is always suggested in such cases. But I confess that at this moment, at any rate, I should be very reluctant indeed to see measures of that kind resorted to. It is at the best a clumsy, and very often an ineffective remedy. You may apply coercion if you want to obtain payment of a sum of money or the cession of a certain portion of territory, or perhaps the dismissal of an official. But you cannot obtain reforms by means of the sending of gunboats or by any other manifestation of that kind. You cannot send a force to penetrate into these remote places and supervise the actual way in which the administration of the country is carried out. Therefore, I am not very much in favour of these drastic proceedings.

Then we come to the other suggestion—the suggestion of a conference. I am not going to say a word in disparagement of a conference, because a conference was my particular remedy, which I endeavoured to bring about. My noble friend opposite has reminded the House that the results of that attempt were by no means encouraging. Your Lordships, will, I think, recollect that, although we made a very strong appeal to the Powers, our appeal met with no response, and no conference was called. You cannot compel Governments which do not wish to take part in a conference to associate themselves with you in such a policy. Before you can expect really to gain anything from a conference you must be sure that two conditions are present. You must be sure that the other Powers concerned are willing to take part in a conference, and you must also be reasonably satisfied that they are prepared to give effect to the kind of policy that you intend to recommend to them. If neither of those conditions is present the only result of a conference is to exhibit in the most public and unfortunate manner the discord which exists, and the cause which you are really endeavouring to promote stands a very fair chance of losing, instead of gaining, ground.

Although, to my mind, neither measures of coercion nor the invitation to a conference at this moment holds out very promising prospects, we may I trust look in other directions for more hopeful symptoms. My noble friend has told the House how matters stand at Brussels with regard to the movement which has for some time been on foot for the annexation of the Congo State by the Belgian Government. I am persuaded that if that annexation can be brought about, and brought about on proper conditions—because I think that is a most important reservation—that is really by far the most promising solution of which the circumstances admit. We know the Belgian Government to be a humane and enlightened Government, and we have every reason to hope that the Congo State administered by the Belgian Government would soon come to wear a very different aspect from that which it presents to the world at present. But I do feel that if, as I believe is the case, we have a right to assume that a genuine movement in favour of annexation is at this moment in progress, the time is not one when we should, either by our acts or by our language in Parliament, do anything which might have the effect of embarrassing the Belgian Government and increasing the difficulty of the task before it.

At such a moment I should say by all means let us give all the diplomatic encouragement we possibly can to the movement for annexation, but let us be careful how we use any language which might be interpreted by the Belgian Government as implying threats or dictation. I have only to say that I was glad to listen to the hopeful language used by my noble friend who represents the Foreign Office towards the close of his remarks. I trust that before many months we may find that events will move rapidly in the direction of annexation, and that we may be in a position to congratulate ourselves upon a distinctly improved prospect. I was not less pleased to hear the words spoken by the representative of the Foreign Office this evening, which suggested to the House that if those hopes should be unfortunately frustrated, His Majesty's Government would certainly not regard themselves as being at the end of their resources, and that they would be prepared—but only at the proper time—to resort to other measures, which, of course, it would be most unfair to specify or to describe at the present time, for the purpose of putting an end to a condition of things profoundly mortifying to all who have at heart the honour and reputation of this country.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, I wish to thank the noble Marquess for the speech he has just made, and for the just appreciation which he entertains of the position at the present moment. In the debate which took place in this House last year it was laid down, with the agreement of both sides, that there was then a hope that the question would be taken up by the Belgian Government with a possible view of the annexation of the Congo State by Belgium, and that it was very undesirable that any language should be used or any steps taken which might be unacceptable to the people of Belgium or which might appear on our part to be unduly interfering in a matter which lay, no doubt, entirely in their own discretion. There has been delay—a delay which, as my noble friend said, is mortifying and deeply to be regretted; but it is only consistent with the policy which was expressed last year that the Government should be very careful not to do anything which would have the appearance of interference with the discretion of the Belgian Parliament. But, my Lords, I do not regret that this discussion has taken place. I think that the time has come when it is important that one of the Houses of the British Parliament should say that the opinion of this country is unchanged on this question, and that there is practically, with respect to the principles of the matter, perfect unanimity among both parties in this country. That has been shown by the discussion to-day. But if, as I think wisely and properly, the Secretary of State has hesitated to do anything which would look like undue pressure upon the free action of the Belgian Government, there is no doubt that, looking at the responsibilities which we have upon us, and looking to those international instruments to which my noble friend has alluded and by which we and other nations are bound —there is no doubt that the policy which has hitherto guided us does not relieve us from our responsibilities, which necessarily rest upon us by our engagements. I agree, therefore, with the noble Marquess in the policy he has described. I share with him the belief in the inapplicability of any system of force, and I agree with him entirely in the matter of a conference. There is only one matter to which the noble Marquess does not allude—namely, the certainty that a conference, according to all recent experience, is not a speedy manner of settling an international difficulty. We ask for patience, though there has been no lack of patience. But we are bound to be patient with a great and free people, and therefore we ask that a certain amount of patience should be accorded to us.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I must say one word in personal explanation after what has been said by my noble friend the Under-Secretary. I never suggested for a moment that my noble friend was indifferent to these Congo atrocities. All I said was that the Government were somewhat too cautious in the matter. I accept absolutely the noble Lord's explanation that neither he nor Sir Edward Grey intended, in the debate in June, 1904, to criticise in any way the action of the noble Marquess. If he says so, no doubt it is correct; but, on reading the debate, it did not occur to me that it was anything other than a rather severe censure on the action of the noble Marquess. My noble friend has not categorically answered the appeal I made to him to say whether annexation does not interfere with the Berlin Act. I understand that the position of England is perfectly sound on that matter. We have, no doubt, no right to suggest to Belgium whether she should annex or not, but we have a right to suggest that the matter would not be settled by annexation. I would like to ask my noble friend whether he is willing to give the title deeds or some Papers showing the powers of the concessionnaires, and what title they have to enforce forced labour on the natives. As regards the rest of the Papers, I shall be satisfied with the assurance of the noble Lord that at the first opportunity he will lay such Papers on the Table as may be expedient.

*LORD FITZMAURICE: I had intended to suggest to my noble friend Lord Mayo that he should communicate with the Foreign Office in regard to the particular Papers he desired. If those Papers can be laid, we shall be able to comply with his request. I need hardly say that I shall do all in my power to satisfy his wishes; but I do not think it would be prudent for me to give a positive pledge until I know exactly what the Papers are which he desires.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I beg to give notice that I will to-morrow put the following Question to His Majesty's Government—viz., "To ask, with reference to the statement made on the 26th instant by the Prime Minister as to the course of Parliamentary business, whether the Lord Privy Seal will give this House any information, and, if so, when, in regard to the dates at which the measures which His Majesty's Government hope to pass into law during the present session will probably come before this House, and approximately the number of days which, in his estimation, will be sufficient for the discussion of the more important of those measures."

House adjourned at half-past Eight o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 29th July, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL [LORDS] (STANDING ORDER APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Sunderland Corporation Bill. Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

North British Railway Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Selsey Water Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill, "To confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1829, relating to Paisley Corporation," presented by Mr. Sinclair, and ordered, under Section 7 of the Act, to be considered upon Wednesday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Imported Watch-cases Bill, without Amendment.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill, with Amendments.

PETITION.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petition from London and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Report of the Commissioners for the period from 1st April, 1906, to 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (GALWAY).

Copy presented, of Report of the President of Queen's College (Galway) for the Session 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS (IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 10th April; Mr. Boland]; to lie upon the Table.

SANITARY OFFICERS IN RURAL DISTRICTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th April; Sir John Dickson-Poynder]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 273.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for Secondary Schools, Wales (in force from 1st August, 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Fifty-first Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Return for the year ended 31st March, 1907, of the Army and Navy Officers permitted, under Rule 2 of the Regulations drawn up under Section 6 of the Act, to hold civil employment for profit under Public Departments [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 274.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copies presented, of Colonial Report No. 530 (Northern Territories of the Gold Coast, Annual Report for 1906); No. 531 (Sierra Leone, Annual Report for 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3876 and 3877 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Chamber of London. Annual Accounts of the Chamberlain of London for the year 1906 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 275.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Provincial Telephone Charges.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): To ask the Postmaster-General whether it is now in contemplation to revise the provincial tariff of telephone charges; and whether this revision has involved, and is likely to involve in future, a considerable increase in many cases in the cost of telephone messages in this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The rates of subscription to provincial exchanges of the Post Office have been recently revised on the basis of a measured rate under which the payment made by each subscriber corresponds with the quantity and quality of the telephone exchange service that he receives. The minimum cost of an exchange line has been increased from £4 10s. to £5 a year, but 500 local calls are now allowed for £5 instead of 480 as under the former rate. The rate charged for local calls in excess of 1,000 per annum has been reduced from 1d. to $\frac{3}{4}$d., and for calls above 2,000 to $\frac{1}{2}$d. A cheaper two-party-line service is also given. The unlimited service rate is not now offered to subscribers.

Buncrana Telephonic Facilities.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General what is the cause of the delay in the giving of telephonic facilities to Buncrana and Fahan; and when does the Postmaster-General now expect the service to be available.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The delay in providing the telephone line between Londonderry and Buncrana is due to wayleave difficulties, which have prevented the erection of the line on the railway as proposed. It has now been found necessary to erect a new pole line on the public road; permission for its erection has been sought from the county council, and, after it has been received, it is feared that four months must elapse before the work can be completed.

Second Ballots.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has in the possession of his Department any information of the regulations and procedure governing the second ballot at elections in different European countries; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of issuing it.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Local Government Board have no special information in their possession on this subject. I may, however, draw my hon. friend's attention to some Reports obtained by the Foreign Office in relation to the matter, which will be found in the three Parliamentary Papers numbered Cd. 2987 of 1881, Cd. 3159 of 1882, and Cd. 6953 of 1893.

Duty on Manufactured Silver.

MR PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what was the average amount of revenue acquired from the duty imposed on manufactured silver during the past five financial years.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) There has not, within the period stated, been any duty either of Customs or Excise upon manufactured silver.

Boy Clerks in the Civil Service.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Civil Service Commissioners give a preference by means of service marks to boy clerks who have served in other departments in what are advertised as open competitions for assistantships of Excise and Customs; whether he is aware that this is a preference to London boys, who constitute the great majority of boy clerks, and a corresponding handicap to the provinces; and whether he will see that in future competitions absolute equality is given to boys in all parts of the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. I think there are good reasons for the preference given to boy clerks by the system referred to, and these reasons are not invalidated by the fact that service in the capacity of boy clerk is naturally more attractive to those who reside in or near London than the boys from the provinces.

Trade Marks on Boxes.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that, by Clauses 15 and 16 of Customs General Order, 26th February, 1900, empty boxes, printed with English wording and manufactured abroad, are imported as coverings, and are not obliged to bear upon them any indication as to their place of origin; and whether, inasmuch as these boxes are complete in themselves, he will cause instructions to be issued so that such boxes shall be treated as manufactured articles to which The Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, is applicable.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have nothing to add at present to my Answer of the 15th instant on this subject.†

Sugar and Tea Duties.

MR. GWYNN (Galway): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can estimate the sums raised from Ireland by the existing taxes on sugar and tea, respectively; and if he can say what Ireland's contribution would amount to were the same amount of revenue raised by direct instead of by indirect taxation.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the Return of Revenue and Expenditure for 1906–7 (England, Scotland, and Ireland), No. 245, of 1907, which shows that the total revenue derived from the Tea and Sugar Duties was £11,839,000, to which Ireland contributed £1,154,000, or 9·7 per cent. If the same total amount were raised by direct taxation, the amount of Ireland's contribution would, of course, depend on the nature of the direct taxes imposed. The percentage of Ireland's present contribution to the income-tax is 3·4 per cent., and to the death duties 3·6 per cent.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 336–7.

Guaranteed Loans for the Colonies.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if it is over thirty years since the Government had guaranteed a loan for any self-governing Colony; and what are the extraordinary circumstances which have induced it to break this long-standing practice in favour of the Transvaal Colony.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The last occasion was in 1873. The reasons for the present proposal will be fully explained when Parliament is asked to sanction the giving of the guarantee.

Mr. FELL: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state how much is outstanding at the present time of the loans guaranteed by the British Government to Colonies with responsible Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The total net amount outstanding in respect of such loans is £2,268,980 7s. 7d. Full particulars were stated in a reply I gave to an unstarred Question by the hon. Member for Tiverton on the 17th instant †

Salt Tax Prosecution in Bombay.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet received any information with regard to the case reported some weeks ago of a Bombay mill operative who was fined ten rupees for scraping up half an ounce of salt from the sea shore; whether it is necessary for the protection of the revenue from salt tax that such prosecutions should take place; and, if so, whether he will press upon the Government of India the importance of reducing public expenditure in order that this tax may be altogether abolished.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have not yet received the information which I undertook to obtain from the Government of Bombay, and I am not at present in a position to express an opinion as to the necessity for such prosecutions. The Government of India are acquainted with my views on the subject of restricting public expenditure in the interest of the Indian taxpayer, and on the subject of the salt duty; and these questions will continue to receive my closest attention.

Official Visits to India.

Mr. LAIDLAW: To ask the Secretary of State for India if he can see his way to pay a visit to India during the recess; and, should this be impossible or inconvenient, will he arrange for the Under-Secretary to do so.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) My hon. friend's Questions are not at all unnatural, and I am very sorry that my answer to them must in both cases be in the negative.

Herbert Estate, County Kerry.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that about twenty of the tenants of the late Herbert estate, in the county of Kerry, which was sold under the Land Purchase Acts, have had their holdings purchased over their heads by Lord Ardilaun; and whether he can take any steps to give these tenants the benefits of land purchase which Lord Ardilaun's action had deprived them of.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not in a position to add anything to the reply which my predecessor gave to the hon. Member's Question on this subject on 2nd April 1906.‡

Failure of Kinvara (Galway) Crops.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the apprehended failure of the potato and other crops in the Kinvara district, Galway, this year owing to the abnormally wet year; and whether it is the intention of the Government to pass the Bill introduced some time ago to enable the county council, in conjunction with theCongested Districts Board and the Agricultural Board, to carry out the projected scheme of improvement to Kinvara harbour.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 668.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clv , 130.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Reports which the Local Government Board have received from the Kinvara district show that the potato crop is well up to the average, and that if good weather should continue for the next fortnight the harvest will be satisfactory. The Prime Minister has already announced that it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill.

Education Estimates.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that, whereas the Education Estimates for England and Wales increased from £9,557,129 in 1900–1 to £13,593,646 in 1907–8, and the Education Estimates for Scotland increased from £1,333,221 to £2,022,554 in the same period, the Education Estimates for Ireland advanced only from £1,387,503 to £1,408,360; whether the percentage of increase in the seven years was 43 in the case of England, 51 in the case of Scotland, and only 1·5 in the case of Ireland; and whether he will endeavour to secure for Ireland increased financial assistance for primary education in proportion to the needs of Irish children.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I can only repeat the Answer which I have already given to similar Questions, namely, that a comparison between the Votes mentioned in the Question cannot justly be instituted. The Votes for England and Scotland include provision for secondary and technical education, while the Vote for Ireland refers to primary education alone, and indeed does not include the whole of the provision voted for that service. Secondary and technical education are otherwise provided for in Ireland. But, apart from comparisons, I may say that I will do everything in my power to obtain fuller recognition of the special claims of Ireland in respect of primary education. The hon. Member is probably aware that last week my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer received an important deputation on the subject, and promised sympathetic consideration of the entire question.

Drishane Land Dispute.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received a statement of claim from an evicted tenant named John R. O'Sullivan in respect of lands on the estate of Mrs. Jane J. Singleton, situate at Cloughoulabeg E.D., Drishane, union of Millstreet, and at present in occupation of a planter named Richard T. Pomeroy; has this claim been investigated and reported on by an estates inspector; and, if so, will he say whether John R. O'Sullivan has been noted as a person to whom the provisions of the Evicted Tenants Bill may apply, and who will be restored to his older holding or one of equivalent value.

To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Mr. John R. O'Sullivan asking to be reinstated in his former holding on the lands of Cloughoulabeg E.D., Drishane, union of Millstreet, and estate of Mrs. Singleton; are these evicted lands at present in the hands of the middleman, Daniel Sullivan, and, if so, will he state whether the latter has been approached with a view to allowing the evicted tenant back to his old farm; what has been the result of the inquiries and investigations carried out at the instance of the Estates Commissioners in regard to this case; and when may the evicted tenant hope to be restored to the land again.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received applications from John R. O'Sullivan for reinstatement in holdings now occupied by Richard Pomeroy and Daniel Sullivan. The Commissioners have fully investigated both cases, and have decided that they can take no action in either.

Irish Land Titles.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that every purchaser under The Land Purchase Act, 1903, has by statutory rights his title registered free of charge; whether the local registration of titles office issues the land certificate of the purchase to the Land Commission only after payment to him of a fee of 10s.; why is such a fee charged; and whether he will direct that it will be no longer levied.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Since 1891 the titles of all purchasing tenants have been registered under statute free of charge. If, however, the purchaser demands a certificate of title he is charged a fee of 10s. in accordance with the schedule of fees prescribed under statute, but the procurement of such a certificate is entirely optional. Under the Act of 1903 purchasers from the Land Commission or the Congested Districts Board are relieved from the payment of a fee for a certificate of title. I have no power to direct any alteration in the scale of fees.

Irish Teachers' Salaries.

MR. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland now see any difficulty about complying with the repeated requests made to them as to the payment of teachers' salaries every month.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I understand that the only difficulty in the way of paying the teachers' salaries monthly is that a very large increase of staff would be necessary, and this would involve a considerable increase in the Vote. The total number of teachers, pupil teachers, and monitors is about 17,000. The present is not an opportune time for re-opening the question, but it will not be lost sight of in connection with the larger question of primary education generally.

War Department Marquee Contracts.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether investigation is ever made into the conditions and rates of pay agreed to by the contractors for marquees and tents to satisfy his Department that there is no infringement of these conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Immediate inquiry is invariably instituted on receipt of complaint of infringement of the clauses in contracts relating to wages or conditions of labour. Such an inquiry was made in the early part of this year in regard to the execution of certain contracts for tents, and showed that, so far as could be ascertained, the terms of the contract relating to wages were duly observed.

Cost of Army Messing.

COLONEL LONG (Worcestershire, Evesham): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he could state what is the average cost per head borne by officers in the Army for their daily messing, and the expenses of servants and upkeep of the mess; whether any and, if so, what is the average value of rations provided to officers in the Army at the public cost; and whether the cost or any part of the cost of cooks and waiters required to keep up the officers' messing is provided at the public cost.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) For infantry subalterns at Home the average cost per head for daily messing may be taken at 4s. Towards the ordinary expenses of the mess each officer pays a subscription not exceeding eight days pay, and towards incidental expenses not covered by this subscription he pays a sum not exceeding 10s. a month. No rations are granted to officers at Home. At stations abroad, where expenses are high, officers receive a Colonial allowance, under paragraph 290 Allowance Regulations, in aid of the extra cost of living. A free ration or an allowance in lieu is given to every officer at foreign stations. Mess allowances are granted annually in aid of the maintenance of regimental messes at rates set forth in the Allowance Regulations, paragraphs 529 to 531; in the case of an infantry subaltern these come to about £6 a head. In the case of the mounted branches the expenses are a little greater than in the infantry.

Cost of Navy Messing.

COLONEL LONG: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he could state what is the average cost per head borne by officers in the Navy for their daily messing, and the expenses of servants and upkeep of the mess; whether any and, if so, what is the average value of rations provided to officers in the Navy at the public cost; and whether the cost or any part of the cost of cooks and waiters required to keep up the officers' messing is provided at the public cost.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The average cost per head to be borne by officers in the Navy for their daily messing and the expenses of servants and upkeep of the mess is prescribed by the King's Regulations, as follows:—In the Ward Room the monthly mess subscription is not to exceed £3. In the Gun Room the monthly mess subscription is not to exceed 30s.; but in addition to this sum, 5s. may be charged for replacing mess utensils and other necessary expenses; and the following sums may also be allowed for extras should a member choose to indulge in them, viz.:—For commissioned officers, £1 a month. For other members, 10s. a month. Each Ward Room officer entitled to the services of a Marine servant is required to pay the sum of 10s. a month to the man employed; if the services of the man are shared with another officer, each officer is required to pay the sum of 6s. a month to the man. The average value of rations provided for officers in the Navy at the public cost is 10d. per diem. The whole cost as naval ratings of cooks and waiters required to keep up the officers' messing is provided at the public cost.

Examination for Foreign Office Appointments.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether candidates for appointments in the Foreign Office are no longer required nor permitted to be examined in geography as one of the examination subjects; and, if so, what, if any, reason there is for this change.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) It was decided in 1905, after careful consideration, to assimilate the examination for the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service with the examination for the Home and Indian Civil Services, Class 1. This examination is framed in such a manner as to conform with university requirements and to attract candidates from the large universities. It is desirable to adhere as closely as possible to the syllabus which has been adopted for Class I. I understand that it is contemplated to introduce geography at no distant date into the syllabus for Class I., and I shall welcome such a solution.

Government Contracts and Fair Wages.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is the practice of other Government Departments, in cases of dispute in reference to the current rate and condition of employment, and whether a particular contractor is or is not carrying out the terms of the fair wages clause, to refer to the Labour Department of the Board of Trade for inquiry and report.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Th Labour Department of the Board o Trade is frequently consulted by other Departments as regards current rate of wages or conditions in particular trades or localities, but a question whether a particular contractor is or is not carrying out the terms of the fair wages clause is and must always remain a matter for the decision of the Department directly concerned with the contract.

Belfast Harbour Commissioners.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will have printed and circulated with the Votes a copy of the letter which he received recently from the Belfast Harbour Commissioners to certain questions regarding that body, together with the effect of any supplementary information which he may have received from the Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The letter which I received from the Belfast Harbour Commissioners was in the following terms:—

Belfast Harbour Commissioners.
Harbour Office,
Belfast,
6th July, 1907.

Sir,

I am instructed by the Belfast Harbour Commissioners to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 4th instant (H. 8441) transmitting a series of Questions proposed to be asked in the House of Commons by Mr. Devlin, M.P., on the subject of the affairs of this trust.

I am to point out by way of preface that the statements contained in the Questions are so varied and cover such a large field of statistical and other matters that it is obviously impossible, in the limited time permitted for reply, that a full and satisfactory answer can be made to the many points on which information is desired.

I am, however, directed by the Commissioners to deal with the subject matter of the Questions as fully as the circumstances will admit, and to say that the Commissioners observed in the press some vague and general statements reflecting on the Board made by Mr. Carlisle at a luncheon on the 27th ultimo, of which they took no notice.

The Commissioners are not aware whether Messrs. Harland and Wolff refused to tender for ships in consequence of a refusal on the part of the Commissioners to give them ground, but if they did so refuse to tender the fault does not lie with the Commissioners, as they never declined to let ground to this firm. As a matter of fact the Commissioners have about 140 acres of ground which they are desirous to let for shipbuilding purposes.

A special plot of land, containing about forty acres suitable for shipbuilding purposes on the east side of Musgrave Channel, was put up for letting by public auction on the 6th October, 1903, in accordance with the provisions of the Harbour Acts. See following advertisement cutting:—

Belfast Harbour.

The Belfast Harbour Commissioners are prepared, in pursuance of their statutory powers, to let on lease for thirty-one years a plot of ground on the County Down side of the harbour, containing an area of forty acres or thereabouts.

The ground is admirably suited for shipbuilding, engineering, and other kindred purposes, being situate on the east side of the Musgrave Channel and having water frontage suitable for the launching of vessels.

The premises will be offered for letting by public competition by Messrs. Clarke and Son, at the Harbour Office, on Tuesday, the 6th October, 1903, at one o'clock.

For full particulars and conditions of letting, apply to the Commissioners' solicitor, Edward Bates, 11 Lombard Street, Belfast; or to W. A. Currie, Secretary to the Commissioners, Harbour Office, Belfast. 18th August 1903.

Mr. Carlisle and others were present, but no offer was made.

The statement that the policy pursued by the trust for the past five years has been a source of trouble is without foundation.

It is also untrue that the trust has allowed not only the docks but the entrances to the docks to silt up.

As for the statement that in some cases Messrs. Harland and Wolff "had the greatest difficulty in getting the Commissioners to remove the silt prior to the launching of large ships," the Commissioners have to state that Messrs. Harland and Wolff's lease provides that the Commissioners shall give a depth of water opposite the launching ways of not less than ten feet at low water of ordinary tides. Notwithstanding this, the Commissioners have largely exceeded the said depth. Any special dredging required for gigantic ships the Commissioners have always undertaken, at the shipbuilders' expense in the first instance, the silt afterwards being removed gratuitously by the Commissioners when required for launches. With regard to the statement made by the chairman of this trust as to a proposed expenditure by Messrs. Harland and Wolff of £50,000 on additional plant, Messrs. Harland and Wolff's solicitor, in October, 1906, made certain proposals to the Commissioners as to a large floating crane, and stated that they, Harland and Wolff, had been going into the matter for some months previously, and that, although they would prefer the Commissioners should provide the crane, they were then prepared to give out a contract for the supply of the same, and he asked the Commissioners for certain facilities in connection therewith. This is the matter to which the chairman referred in his statement of the 18th ultimo, the plans having been shown to him the previous day by Messrs. Harland and Wolff's solicitor. The facilities referred to in connection with this crane would cost the Commissioners a large sum of money, and the whole matter is still under consideration. Belfast Harbour is amply equipped with cranes sufficient for all ordinary shipbuilding work, including a crane erected at very considerable expense capable of dealing with lifts up to 100 tons. The Commissioners believe that at other shipbuilding centres in the Kingdom facilities of this character are provided by the shipbuilders themselves. There is no foundation for the statement that Messrs. Harland and Woolff offered to take £30,000 worth of harbour stock, and that the Commissioners refused to consider the offer. The Commissioners are engaged in constructing a graving dock for shipbuilding purposes at a cost of some £320,000. To induce them to undertake this huge expenditure Lord Pirrie, who was then a member of the Board, promised to take up £200,000 of Belfast harbour stock. This promise is still unredeemed. The following are the names of the present members of the Trust and the number of votes recorded for each on their last contested election :—

	Number of votes at last contested election.
Chairman, Mr. Robert Thompson, Drum House, Belfast -	3,502
Mr. John Andrews, Greenville, Bloomfield - - - - -	3,237
Mr. George S. Clark, M.P., Dunlambert, Fortwilliam Park, Belfast - - - - - -	—
Sir Thomas J. Dixon, Bart., Graymount, Belfast - -	—
Mr. R. E. Herdman, Rosavo, Cultra - - - - - -	3,272
Mr. Frederick L. Heyn, Darina, Strandtown - - - -	—
Mr. William J. Jackson, Ingledene, Cultra - - - - -	—
Sir Otto Jaffe, Kinedar, Strandtown - - - - - -	2,633
Mr. David C. Kemp, Cultra -	3,409
Mr. Samuel Lawther, Mount Vernon, Belfast - - -	3,300
Mr. John Lepper, Barnageeha, Fortwilliam Park, Belfast -	3,303
Mr. James M'Connell, Stranmillis House, Belfast - -	3,417
Mr. Richard Paterson, Kilmore, Holywood - - - -	3,468
Mr. Hugh M. Pollock, 11, College Gardens, Belfast - - -	—
Mr. William R. Rea, Abbeylands, Whiteabbey - - -	3,434
Mr. John Rogers, 22, Derryvolgie Avenue, Belfast - -	2,869
The Right Hon. The Earl of Shaftesbury, Belfast Castle, Belfast - - - - - -	—
Mr. Thomas F. Shillington, Dromart, Antrim Road, Belfast - - - - - -	—
Mr. John Sinclair, 8, College Gardens, Belfast - - -	3,594
Mr. William Williames, Cornwall Villa, Holywood - - -	3,448
Mr. James Wilson, Old Forge, Dunmurry - - - -	3,348
The Lord Mayor of Belfast, *ex officio.*	

Of the above Commissioners three have been co-opted, viz., Mr. George S. Clark, M.P., shipbuilder; Sir Thomas J. Dixon, Baronet, shipowner; The Right Hon. The Earl of Shaftesbury, K.C.V.O., Lord Mayor of Belfast. Some of the other members were originally co-opted and the co-options have been confirmed at subsequent elections. The officers of the trust (clerical and engineering) number fifty-eight, and their salaries amount to £1,147 12*s.* 6*d.* per month. The amount paid in weekly wages, based on four weeks in June last, is £803 to 669 persons. It is incorrect to state that the Belfast Harbour Commissioners invariably co-opt gentlemen on their Board who have no enterprise in shipping or port work. Two of the last three co-options were :—Mr. George S. Clark, M.P., a director of the well-known Belfast shipbuilding firm of Workman, Clark, and Co., Limited, and a large shipowner; and Sir Thomas J. Dixon, Bart., senior partner of the well-known firm of Thomas Dixon and Sons, Belfast, who own and manage a shipping tonnage of 29,000 registered tons. The electors have in every instance in the past history of the trust, with one exception, endorsed the action of the Commissioners in their co-options, and have always aimed at having a representation of the various industries on the Board. More than half of the present members are interested in shipping. All co-options of Commissioners must take place within one month from the date of the vacancy which they are elected to fill. The Commissioners cannot control the dates of such vacancies either by death or otherwise. There is no foundation whatever for the statement that any friction has been going on or has ever gone on between the harbour trust and its employees. The chief and staple industry of Belfast is the linen industry, and the Commissioners are not aware that its destruction has been threatened. As for the shipbuilding industry, it is well known that it is in a most flourishing condition.

I am, etc.,
(Sd.) W. A. Currie,
Secretary.

The Assistant Secretary,
Harbour Department, Board of Trade,
7, Whitehall Gardens, London, S.W.

From subsequent communications it appears that the date of the last election, which was not contested, was the 28th March last, and that of the last contested election was 29th March, 1906. At the latter the number of voters was 8,259, and the numbers of voting papers to which they were entitled was 14,175. Each voting paper entitles the holder to vote for not more than seven candidates, and the total number of votes recorded in 1906 was 24,059.

Board of Works—Contracts Clause.

Mr. TREVELYAN: To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether any alterations have been made in the conditions inserted in notices and contracts by the Board of Works since the Return given in Parliamentary Paper, No. 277, of Session 1896, page 123, Appendix No. 1; and, if so, what the alterations are.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) With a view to ensuring still further that the workmen employed by the contractors of this Department shall receive the accepted wages in their respective trades, the following clause has been drawn up and included in all the building and engineering contracts of the Office of Works:—The wages paid by the contractor to workmen employed by him on the execution of works shall be those generally accepted in each trade for competent workmen in the district where they are employed, and the contractor's wages books and time sheets for all workmen, so far as they relate to this contract, shall be open to the inspection of the Commissioners of Works, or their representatives, at such times as they may think fit. With regard to manufactured goods, such as furniture, the following clauses, designed with the same purpose, are included, as far as possible, in the Board's contracts: Wages.—The wages paid in the execution of this contract shall be those generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen in the district where the work is carried out. Work in Factory.—The contractors shall undertake that all articles included in this contract shall be made in their own factory or workshop at——— Inspection of Work, Wages Books, etc.—The contractors' factories and workshops and the goods in process of manufacture, and also the contractors' wages books and time sheets shall be open to inspection at all reasonable times by the controller of supplies or his representative. In addition the Board have provided in their contracts for specific building works, that—The builder shall pay the workmen employed on the work at the building or on the site and not elsewhere. Though not mentioned in the Return of 1896, this is a provision of more than twenty years standing.

Civil Service Transfers.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will furnish a Return showing the names of all persons admitted into the Civil Service, or transferred from one department of that service to another, under Clause 7 of the Order in Council of 1870, specifying from what position and to what position they were transferred, and the date of the transfer; the Return to cover the past twenty-five years.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will grant a Return as regards promotions from the Second Division to superior appointments, specifying the name of the official, the date at which, and the means by which, he entered the service; the name of the appointment to which he was promoted, and the date of the promotion under Clause 18 of the Order in Council dated 12th February, 1876, or the clauses of succeeding Orders which have replaced that clause; the Return to cover the past twenty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I understand that each of these Returns would require a large amount of research, and I do not consider that any purpose they could serve would justify the labour involved in preparing them.

Copper Coinage.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the scarcity of copper coins in country districts; and, if so, whether he will take steps to remedy the scarcity.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I have no evidence that there exists a scarcity of bronze coins in any district. The demands for bronze have been very moderate in amount for the last three months, and the large issues of 1906 appear to have amply satisfied the requirements of the public.

China and Indian Opium.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the purport of the communications made to the Chinese Government with regard to the proposed restriction of the importation of Indian opium into China; and if he will say what measures have been taken in India to carry out the policy of restriction.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) After consulting the Government of India, His Majesty's Government have informed the Chinese Government that (1) they accept in principle the proposal that the import of Indian opium into China shall be diminished by one-tenth annually, *pari passu*, with an equal decrease in the production of the native drug, up to the year 1910, and they will continue to reduce at the same rate the export in 1911 and subsequent years, on proof that China has carried out its share of the arrangement; (2) they have no objection to a Chinese official being stationed at Calcutta, provided that he has no powers of interference; (3) they are prepared to assent to such enhancement of the Customs and likin duty on foreign opium as will make its taxation in China equivalent to the taxation actually levied on native opium, differences in relative value and quality being taken into consideration. Steps have been taken to reduce the area under poppy in Bengal, which in the five years preceding 1906–7 averaged 615,000 acres, and in 1907–8 is not to exceed 562,000 acres. In 1907 the number of chests of Bengal opium fixed for sale was originally 4,400 a month. This has now been reduced to 4,000 a month, while for 1908 it has been fixed at 3,900 a month. Further reductions will be made in succeeding years if the proposed arrangement with the Chinese Government becomes operative.

Irish Board of Works Staff.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that certain technical positions in the Irish Board of Works are confined to persons nominated by one political party in Ireland, he will give instructions that in future nominations for these appointments should be abolished, and that they should be filled by examinations open to all, irrespective of religion or politics.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Open competition is not, in my opinion, a suitable method for filling the technical appointments referred to in the hon. Member's Question. It has been tried, and the result was found to be unsatisfactory. But there is no foundation for the suggestion that the nominations are influenced by considerations of either religion or politics.

Inspectors of Irish National Schools.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether appointments to the position of inspector of Irish national schools are confined to the nominated candidates of the Irish National Education Commissioners; and, if so, seeing that it is no part of the duties of these inspectors to examine children in religion, will he give instructions that all future vacancies in the inspectorate should be open to all candidates, irrespective of religion or politics.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The appointment of inspectors of national schools in Ireland rests with the Commissioners of National Education. Under a longstanding arrangement one half of the inspectors are Roman Catholics and the other half belong to other denominations. The Commissioners inform me that they do not think it desirable to alter this arrangement.

Royal Irish Constabulary Inspectors.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a number of vacancies in the inspectorate of the Royal Irish Constabulary are filled by limited competition amongst nominated and inexperienced candidates; and, if so, seeing that experience in police duties is essential to the discretionary and diplomatic discharge of such duties, and that the police inspectorate in Great Britain is entirely composed of experienced and capable men risen from the ranks, will he give instructions that, in future, the same system should be applied in Ireland as obtains in Great Britain.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I refer to the Answer given by my predecessor to the hon. Member's similar Question on 24th July, 1906.† That Answer still holds good.

Whitechurch Evicted Tenant.

Mr. SHEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received a claim for reinstatement from an evicted tenant named John Ambrose, of New Grove, Whitechurch, county Cork; has this application been yet investigated, and, if so, will he state whether it is proposed to reinstate Ambrose in his old holding under the terms of the Evicted Tenants Bill now before Parliament, or in the alternative to provide him with a farm of equivalent value.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received from John Ambrose an application for reinstatement, and after full inquiries have decided that they can take no action in the case.

Belturbet Evicted Tenant.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Henry M'Cabe, Langham, Belturbet, the son of Peter M'Cabe, deceased, who was evicted from his farm in Lislea, held under Alexander Castle Montgomery, in or about 1885; who is in possession of this farm now; what is the tenure; and will this evicted tenant's son's claim be considered favourably; and will he state the rent of this farm at the date of eviction and the present rent.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received the application in question and have had the case fully inquired into. The holding in which reinstatement is sought is in the occupation of Alexander Turner, who holds it at a judicial rent. The rent at the time of eviction was £16 3s. 10d. per annum, and the present judicial rent is £17. The Commissioners have placed M'Cabe's name on the list of persons suitable to receive an allotment of land, if such should become available.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Coast and River Protection.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is now the policy of the Board of Admiralty to relegate entirely to the Navy the duty of coast and river protection.

The SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee): The Answer is in the negative.

The Coastguard.

Major SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state when the Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on His Majesty's Coastguard will be laid upon the Table.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have as yet nothing to add to my Answer to an identical Question from my hon. and gallant friend on 2nd July.†

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): What arrangement will be made for carrying on the important life-saving services now carried on by the coastguard at places whence they are to be removed?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was unable to answer.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxi., 1023–4.

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 519–20.

Naval Courts-Martial.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is the established practice of the Navy to hold a public court-martial on every officer who loses or surrenders his ship; and, if so, whether he can state why this rule has not been enforced in the case of H.M.S. "Ariel," lost on Malta breakwater on 19th April.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The practice is usual, but not invariable. Where all the facts have been brought out by a Court of Inquiry—as in this case—the Admiralty has power to deal with it directly without further trial. The officer in question was censured.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) asked whether the procedure differed from that which was followed five years ago in the case of the hon. Member who put this somewhat ungenerous Question.

MR. BELLAIRS asked whether it was ungenerous to ask such a Question when, where a court-martial was held, the sword of an officer was returned to him with honour where there was no fault on his part. That was the reason why he put the Question.

MR. DALZIEL: May I ask for an Answer to my Question?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON requested the hon. Member to give notice.

MR. BELLAIRS: May I ask what is the insinuation which the hon. Member desires to make against me?

MR. DALZIEL: The only explanation I desire to make——

MR. SPEAKER: All this is quite irregular. It is a dispute between two hon. Members.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Let them step outside.

Colonial Naval Defence.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the First Lord of the Admiralty relied on the best naval opinion or on his own conclusions in advising the Premiers at the Colonial Conference to spend money on small flotillas of torpedo boats and submarines as an admirable means of coast defence, and in the assertion that the use of this method of defence practically prevents all danger of a sudden raid such as might be made by a cruising squadron.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The hon. Member scarcely needs to be assured that my noble friend went to the Conference with a full sense of his responsibility, and put forward the carefully considered views of the Admiralty Board.

Naval Officers and the Press.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the rule prohibiting officers on full pay from communicating directly or indirectly with the Press applies to all officers serving at the Admiralty; and whether the rule is, and has been, strictly enforced so that all members of the Board and their subordinates observe it.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Apparently the hon. Member refers to Article 12 of the King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions, which is binding upon all officers serving under the Board of Admiralty on shore. There is no reason to suppose that the rule is not strictly observed.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Is the rule strictly observed in the case of the First Sea Lord?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: He is not an officer on full pay.

Destroyers in the Mediterranean.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that in 1902 a committee on the Mediterranean station, consisting of Vice-Admiral Prince Louis of Battenburg, Rear-Admiral Charles Briggs, and Captain Madden, with the approval of the then Commander-in-Chief, Sir John Fisher, drew up, after close investigation, the requisite strength of destroyers required on the Mediterranean station in case of war with a foreign nation, which foreign nation has since considerably strengthened its torpedo flotilla; whether he is aware that this committee unanimously recommended forty-eight destroyers as the minimum requirements of the station; and whether, under these circumstances, he can state the reasons which have induced the Government to cut down the number of destroyers on the station from thirty-four in January, 1906, to eleven at the present time.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The report of such a committee as the hon. Gentleman refers to would be of a strictly confidential character, and not the proper subject of Question and Answer in this House. All that I can say is that the strategical conditions governing the distribution of the Fleet now are not the same as they were in 1902.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of disclosing all the confidential documents at the Admiralty for the benefit of foreign Powers?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No, Sir.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: That is the policy of these hon. Members.

Cordite Committee.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Cordite Committee has yet reported; and whether any information in reference to the Report of Evidence will be afforded to the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The Committee has not yet reported.

MR. BELLAIRS: Can the right hon. Gentleman answer the second part of the Question?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Will the Committee report before the end of the session?

MR. HALDANE asked for notice.

Cavalry of the Territorial Army.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the new cavalry of the Territorial Army are to be trained as cavalry or mounted infantry; and, if the former, will he explain the utility of a sword-bayonet as a weapon for a cavalry soldier.

MR. HALDANE: The Cavalry of the Territorial Army will have to be trained to perform such essential cavalry functions as are necessary for home defence. As I have already stated, I am not yet in a position to say whether the performance of these duties will necessitate any alteration in the arms now carried by the Imperial Yeomanry.

MAJOR SEELY: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider, in view of the fact that the only possible reinforcement of the Cavalry in time of war will be the Yeomanry, it will be as well to arm both with the same weapon?

MR. HALDANE: That will be considered.

Yeomanry Rifle.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Yeomanry will be re-armed with the short rifle before the drill season of 1908; whether it is proposed that the rifle should be carried in buckets as in the Cavalry; and whether the buckets will be issued at the same time as the rifle by the War Office.

MR. HALDANE: In reply to the first part of the Question I doubt whether it will be possible to re-arm the Yeomanry before next year's training. As regards the second part of the Question it is not proposed to replace the short bucket at present in possession, which is found quite suitable for use with the short rifle by units not armed with the sword.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): If the Yeomanry are not to be re-armed will the scheme of training for next year remain unaltered?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot say as yet.

Territorial Army—Arming of Cavalry.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the

Cavalry supernumerary to the Yeomanry regiments of the Territorial Army, and intended to form the divisional Cavalry of the expeditionary force, are to be armed with the rifle and bayonet or with cavalry weapons.

MR. HALDANE: These troops will be armed with the rifle and sword bayonet.

Audit of Grants to Territorial Associations.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any further information to give with regard to the audit of grants to territorial associations either by qualified chartered or incorporated accountants; and whether the claims of both classes of qualified accountants will be duly considered in this connection.

MR. HALDANE: The scheme will be worked out during the coming autumn, and the point raised in regard to accountants will be fully considered.

Soldiers Mufti Regulations.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, permission to wear plain clothes having now been granted to officers, to warrant officers, and to some non-commissioned officers, when not on duty, and to other ranks when playing certain games, he will extend the same permission to all men of good character who are in possession of a standing pass.

MR. HALDANE: The extension of the privilege to wear plain clothes has only recently been made to certain classes of non-commissioned officers. Soldiers of good character are under existing regulations permitted, at the discretion of their commanding officer, to wear plain clothes on pass or furlough beyond the limits of the garrison in which they are quartered. It is not proposed further to extend this privilege.

Public Accounts Committee's Report.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to paragraph 5 of the Second Report of the Committee of Public Accounts, if he will furnish the names and addresses of the South African Garrison Institutes from whom the immediate repayment of the £9,294 is pressed for by the Committee, specifying the amount claimed against each, and in every case stating whether the institute concerned is used by officers, non-commissioned officers, or men.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member:—

To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to paragraph 16 of the Second Report of the Committee of Public Accounts, whether he will in future, before concluding any contract relating to the purchase of articles on which royalties are paid, have a clause inserted providing for a graduated scale of royalty on such articles according to the number purchased, no matter whether the case may be considered important or not at the time of signing.

To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to paragraph 6 of the Second Report of the Committee of Public Accounts, wherein it is stated that a sum of £4,649 is not properly chargeable against Army Votes, owing to the Army Council, without application to the Treasury, having sanctioned the issue of £4,000 to the General Officer Commanding in Scotland for the purpose of paying the fares of Volunteers attending a royal review at Edinburgh, and that a further sum of £649 was spent owing to a miscalculation of the number who would attend; if he is aware that the Director-General of Finance, as accounting officer, recorded his protest against the payment, and only passed it under direct instruction from the supreme head of the Department; and what measures does he intend adopting to prevent the Army Council again irregularly sanctioning the issue of public moneys without first having obtained the authority of the Treasury for so doing.

To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Second Report of the Committee of Public Accounts, wherein it is stated that the Estimate for the actual gross expenditure on the Army Votes during the year 1905–6 was wrong by £1,326,915 8s. 6d.; whether he is aware that the error, which would have been larger by £245,000 but for the additional expenditure sanctioned by the Treasury on the rearmament of the artillery, is nearly twice as large as any that has occurred in Army Votes for the last twenty years, and is considerably in excess of the surplus on the combined Votes of the Navy and Civil Services and Revenue Departments in the same year, where an expenditure of £82,000,000 was involved; and whether, having in view the fact that as regards the future the Committee are without assurance that a more satisfactory result may be expected, and that they express the hope that the responsible Minister of the day will take every means necessary to secure accuracy in estimating expenditure and forecasting liabilities, he will state what measures he intends adopting to obtain this reform in Army accounts.

To ask the Secretary of State for War with reference to paragraph 9 of the Second Report of the Committee of Public Accounts, what have been the average number of gallons of water supplied to the troops last year for each month respectively, and what are the rates under the contract entered into by the General Officer Commanding in South Africa with the municipality of Standerton in 1904, wherein the minimum rate was for 80,000 gallons per diem, and which contract is to run for twenty years from that date; what has to date been the estimated loss incurred by the public through this officer having concluded such a contract without authority; what was the name and rank of this officer; why was the War Office not notified of the fact that a contract of such a nature had been concluded until January, 1906, although the negotiations leading up to the signing of the contract lasted from November, 1903, until 29th July, 1904, thus disproving any urgency or risk of sickness to the troops; and what steps have been taken by the Secretary of State to prevent a repetition either in South Africa or elsewhere by the military authorities.

To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to paragraph 18 of the Second Report of the Committee of Public Accounts, whether the military authorities on realising that, owing to an exceptional drought, the Vaal River for the first time on record was partially dried up, and that all the dams in the vicinity had failed, made any effort to obtain water by artesian boring on the farm they had purchased at Tempe, near Bloemfontein, before leasing the Bishop's Glen farm; and, if not, why and what was the purchase price of the farm at Tempe, its area in acres, the amount spent on it for the purposes of a remount depot before the Bishop's Glen farm was taken over, the rent paid per annum, and the length of the lease of the latter, and the total cost of the buildings, water troughs, and machinery for water supply put up by the military authorities thereon.

To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to paragraph 19 of the Second Report from the Committee of Public Accounts, what were the payments made both under Vote 10 and under the Military Works Loan in respect of contracts placed without competition; what was the nature of each contract; with whom was it concluded; what was the amount involved; and whether any steps have been taken by him to give effect to the hope expressed by the Committee that, having in view the irregularity of such proceedings, there will be no further instances.

To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to paragraph 22 of the Second Report from the Committee of Public Accounts, who were responsible for the facts therein alleged, namely, that a sum of more than £900 was spent in addition to a previous outlay of £3,000 in building a shed for the construction of an elongated balloon, that meanwhile, however, the manufacture proceeded so slowly that by the time the shed was completed other buildings had arisen in the vicinity which forbade the elongated balloon its necessary access to the upper air, the factory for that reason being removed from Aldershot to Swan Plateau at an estimated cost for removal and re-erection of £10,000; and whether any effort has been made to bring them before a court-martial for waste of public money, or in the event of civilians being involved has any suit been instituted against them for recovery.

MR. HALDANE: My hon. friend has put down a number of questions dealing with various paragraphs of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. As I informed the House in reply to a Question put by my hon. friend the Member for Newcastle-under-Lyne on the 25th instant, the Prime Minister has promised that an opportuniy will be given to the House of discussing the Report, and I must ask my hon. friend to be good enough to defer his Questions until the debate is reached.

Cavan Militia Barracks.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state in what condition the Militia barracks at Cavan are at the present time; what is the annual cost of up-keep; what sum has been expended on improving the premises, drainage, etc., in the last five years; how many men are now stationed in these barracks; does the War Office own or occupy any other premises in the town of Cavan; is it proposed to make any alteration in the constitution or numbers of the military now stationed in Cavan; and, if so, what is proposed, and when is it to take effect.

MR. HALDANE: The present condition of the barracks is good. The cost of the annual up-keep is £162. A sum of £1,032 has been spent on improvements in the last five years. One officer and twenty-eight men are now stationed in these barracks. No other property in Cavan is owned by the War Department, but part of the gaol premises is hired for Militia stores. As regards the last two Questions concerning the future constitution of the troops to be stationed there, I am not in a position at present to give any information.

Shoeburyness.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many civilians and how many ex-soldiers are now employed at the works at Shoeburyness; how many have been discharged during the last two months; whether any, and how many, further discharges are in contemplation; and what is the maximum and what the average number of years of service in Government works of the civilians so discharged.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether ex-soldiers entitled to pensions are being retained in the Government service at Shoeburyness, whilst civilians who have served for longer periods, but have no such pension to fall back upon, are being discharged; and whether he can see his way to recognise these facts in any further adjustments.

I beg further to ask the Secretary of State for War whether before making any further discharges of civilians at Shoeburyness, he will cause inquiry to be made into the feasibility of arranging other work for the civilians who are now in risk of discharge, and whose special training may be permanently lost to the public service if they are driven to seek employment elsewhere.

MR. HALDANE: Thirty-six civilians and 122 ex-soldiers are now employed at the works at Shoeburyness. Nineteen civilians and twenty-eight ex-soldiers have been discharged during the last two months, and thirteen further discharges are in contemplation. The maximum number of years of service in Government employ of the civilians so discharged is nine, while the average is six and a quarter years service. As regards retentions in Government service preference is in some cases given to ex-soldiers. I am making inquiries into the point raised in the last Question of the hon. Member. The discharges are due to the completion of some considerable works in connection with the butts.

Royal Army Medical College.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the case of the Royal Army Medical College now being erected at Millbank at a cost of £80,000 of public money, the following sub-contracts have been let abroad, namely granite £2,156, fireproof construction £7,768, asphalte £1,620, wood flooring £1,400, Italian mosaic pavement £800, sanitary and lavatory wares to be made abroad by an English firm with factory abroad £1,800, window-glass in Belgium £260, and paint from Hamburg £100; whether he will state why any or all of these contracts have been placed abroad instead of in this country; and whether any steps were taken to ensure that the fair wages clauses which are enforced in British contracts were observed in any or all of these contracts.

Mr. HALDANE: The Norwegian granite and Frazzi form of fireproof construction were selected on grounds of economy. The asphalte was done by the Val de Travers Company, who hold the War Department Contract for the supply of asphalte generally. The wood-flooring used for building operations is practically all imported. The mosaic flooring was executed by English firms. The sanitary and lavatory wares were supplied by London firms who have large works in this country. It has not been possible to trace, in so short a notice, the source of manufacture of the glass and paint. The notice as to the fair wages clause contained in War Department contracts was posted on the works as well as inserted in the general contract. I would point out that the contract in which these items are included was placed in February, 1905, before I took up office.

Mr. REMNANT: Has the right hon. Gentleman seen the specifications for the different articles and does he accept the responsibility?

Mr. HALDANE said he did not know what was meant by whether he accepted responsibility for specifications made for a contract in February, 1905. The specification was made before he came into office, and he had no reason to think it was not properly made.

Mr. REMNANT: Does the right hon. Gentleman approve of that policy?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a question of opinion.

Mr. REMNANT: Was no British tender invited for these materials?

Mr. HALDANE: I do not know. It was before my time.

Scottish Volunteers and Sunday Entrainment.

Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that many of the Volunteer regiments in Edinburgh and Fife were conveyed to camp by special trains on Sundays; that this is against Scottish sentiment and causes unnecessary Sunday labour; and whether he will issue instructions that in future these movements of Volunteers shall take place only on weekdays.

Mr HALDANE: The arrangement for the conveyance of Volunteers to camp are made under local orders, but I am aware that in some cases the moves take place on Sunday. The railway companies are, I understand, prepared to move units on Saturday in all cases where it is absolutely necessary in the interests of the service, but in view of the heavy public traffic which they have to deal with at this period of the year I do not think they can be asked to do this in every case. Moreover it must be remembered that the Volunteers are carried at a reduced rate as a concession and not as a right.

Viscount TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Does the right hon. Gentleman agree with the view that it is against Scottish sentiment for Volunteers to travel by train on Sunday?

[No Answer was returned.]

Scottish Counties and Militia Quarters.

Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the liabilities on counties in Scotland to provide stores and quarters for Militia battalions under the Militia Act of 1854 will continue in force after the passing of the Territorial Forces Bill; and, if so, what provision has been made for the War Department acquiring these Militia stores and quarters, which were provided and continue to be maintained from county funds.

Mr. HALDANE: So long as the buildings now existing are required for Militia purposes, the liabilities of the counties under the Act of 1854 will continue. I am not in a position at present to give any information on the other points raised in the Question.

Government Lands at Shoeburyness.

Mr. WHITEHEAD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many acres of the land acquired for the Government works at Shoeburyness, in which dismissals are now taking place, are not occupied by buildings; how much of such land will cease to be in active use consequent upon the reduced employment at the works; and whether the War Office are taking any, and, if so, what steps with a view to restoring this land to profitable use, and thus affording opportunities for labour.

MR. HALDANE: The greater part of the Government land at Shoeburyness is required for ranges and danger areas adjoining such ranges. The use of such land is not affected by reduction of men employed at the works at Shoeburyness. Such land as can be put to profitable use without detriment to military requirements is so used.

Disbanded Battalions.

MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hampshire, Basingstoke): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state, as regards officers and non-commissioned officers of the battalions recently disbanded, how many have accepted transfers into other regiments, have been absorbed into their own regiments, have been given temporary appointments, are still without employment; how is it proposed to deal with those now holding temporary appointments when the term for which they have been appointed expires; and are any other, and what, steps being taken to relieve the congestion caused by the reductions.

MR. HALDANE: Thirty-three officers have been transferred with their own consent to other regiments; two lieutenant-colonels have been transferred to the Staff; 160 vacancies in the old establishment have been absorbed, but the new reduced establishment has not yet been reached, and there remain 154 officers supernumerary to the reduced establishment. Sixty-six officers have been given temporary appointments. When the tenure of these appointments expires, their cases will be dealt with as opportunities offer, by extra-regimental promotion or absorption in their own regiments. No other steps are possible than those which are being taken. As regards the non-commissioned officers, of whom there were 803 in the nine battalions at the time the order was issued for their reduction, 435 have been absorbed, discharged at their own wish, or transferred to the Reserve or other units; thus leaving 368 who are employed with the Home battalion or depots of their regiments.

Defences of the Thames and Medway.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if all the mine fields are abolished in the Thames, and the recently mounted guns, new pattern, have been removed from Hope Battery, Cliffe, New Tavern, and Tilbury Forts, and the use of the Brennan torpedo at Cliffe Fort has practically been abandoned.

MR. HALDANE: It is not considered expedient in the interests of the defence the United Kingdom to give any information in reply to the points raised in the Question.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Have any guns been removed? I do not ask how many.

MR. HALDANE: I have answered the Question.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Has not a statement already been made in this House with regard to the abolition of the mines?

MR. HALDANE: If so, it must have been a rash statement.

Royal Engineer Submarine Miners Officers.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what are the intentions of the Government regarding the future of the officers of the Royal Engineer submarine miners; and if it is still the intention to abolish submarine mining for coast and river defence.

MR. HALDANE: As regards the Militia R.E. submarine miners it is proposed to retain all suitable officers who are willing to stay as a reserve for duties in connection with electric lights. In the case of the Volunteer R.E. submarine miners it is proposed to retain the corps, and therefore the officers, at those places where their services are required in connection with electric light duties at an establishment suitable to the requirements in each case. As regards the last part of the Question I am not aware of any change in the general policy as regards submarine mining, but this policy rests with the Admiralty.

Transvaal Loan.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has received information that the loan for £5,000,000 has been passed by the Transvaal Parliament; and has he any summary of the Act, giving the objects upon which the proceeds of the loan are to be spent.

The UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): Yes, Sir, but my semi-official information with regard to its contents can only be of secondary value. The hon. Member will appreciate that we must leave the Bill in its final form.

Mr. FELL: Will full particulars be given this House of the objects to which the money will be applied?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Very full information will be given as to the purposes to which the loan will be applied, so far as that information is in the Government's possession.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Am I not right in saying the Transvaal is a self-governing Colony?

[No Answer was returned.]

Transvaal Parliamentary Debate on Chinese Labour.

Mr. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the interesting statements made in the recent debate in the Transvaal Parliament on the Chinese labour question, the Secretary of State would take steps to have the principal speeches in that debate published in the next Blue-book on South African affairs.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir.

Gambling Dens in the Federated Malay States.

Mr. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps have been taken in fulfilment of the promise made last year for the gradual suppression of licensed gambling dens in the Federated Malay States; and if such steps have been effective in the respective States.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Enactments have now been passed in the four States providing for the prohibition of gambling within areas to be proclaimed by the residents. Copies will be found in the Library. So far as I am aware, the only districts which have yet been proclaimed are the Coast and Tampin districts in the Negri Sembilan. I am not aware how far the prohibition has been effective, but the High Commissioner will shortly be asked for a report. I understand that the leases of the gambling farms in the other States have not yet expired, so that no measure of prohibition is possible at present.

Native Labour on the Rand.

Mr. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information showing that there is now an abundance of native labour for the mines on the Rand.

Mr. CHURCHILL: In his statement at the opening of the Transvaal Parliament on 14th June General Botha said that "the supply of native labour is and has for some time been in marked excess of the demand," also that "owing to the large supply of natives from other sources the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association has for some time stopped recruiting in the Cape Colony, and numbers of labourers recruited have been sent back without obtaining employment." Dr. Jameson stated in the Cape Parliament on 27th June that in the Cape Colony "the present position was that recruiting operations had been entirely stopped, there being at the moment a sufficient supply of labour to meet the requirements of the mines, but it was anticipated that active operations would begin again in August next." He referred to a scheme for facilitating and increasing the supply of labour from the Cape Colony to the Rand which the two Governments have had under their consideration. The Cape Ministers find there is a widespread prejudice against the Rand as a centre of employment among Cape natives, which is not accounted for by aversion to underground employment, and which they desire to remove. They consider that there is no reason why the supply from the Cape Colony should not be materially increased, provided that it is possible to avoid sudden changes in the terms and conditions of employment offered by mine owners, and that any changes which become necessary are brought gradually into effect.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked whether the arrest of the development of the Transvaal did not account for the present supply of native labour, and whether there was a sufficient abundance of labour to replace that of 50,000 Chinamen when they were repatriated.

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich) asked whether General Botha's statements were not made in the course of a debate in the Transvaal Parliament and were denied by Members sitting on the opposite side in that Parliament.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Question on the Paper was whether the Colonial Office had any official information showing that there was now an abundance of native labour. In reply to that Question I have read quotations from speeches of the Prime Minister of the Transvaal and the Prime Minister of Cape Colony.

MR. BONAR LAW: Can the right hon. Gentleman consider that statements made in debate, all of which were denied at the time, constitute official information?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir, I think we are certainly entitled to attach some importance to the statements of the heads of self-governing Colonies.

*MR. MACKARNESS asked whether Dr. Jameson's statement in the Cape Parliament was not made in reply to a question put after notice.

MR. CHURCHILL: I believe that was so.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked the right hon. Gentleman to reply to his Question as to whether the plentiful supply of natives was not due to the stoppage of development work in the Transvaal, and whether the right hon. Gentleman had any reason to think that there would be an abundance of labour after the repatriation of the Chinese.

MR. CHURCHILL: That is not the Question on the Paper. I have my own opinion on the matter the hon. Gentleman refers to, and I shall be prepared to supply an Answer to a Question on the subject if put in the proper form on the Paper.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether he can find a Colonial Premiership for the hon. Gentleman?

SIR GILBERT PARKER: May I ask, Sir, whether the supplementary Question I asked was not derived from the Question?

MR. SPEAKER: I thought the Question sufficiently cognate to allow it to pass; but if the right hon. Gentleman has no information at his disposal he is quite right to ask for notice.

Kaffirs and the Rand.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it was part of the arrangement with the Transvaal Government for the repatriation of the Chinese that Kaffirs were to be attracted to the Rand by the increase of facilities for the sale and supply of intoxicants to natives; and what steps His Majesty's Government propose to take, in the interests of the natives, with reference to the Bill to amend the Liquor Law which has been introduced by the Transvaal Government into the Colonial Legislature.

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know what the hon. Member means by an arrangement with the Transvaal Government, but at any rate the reply to the first part of the Question is, as he knows perfectly well, in the negative; as to the second paragraph I have no knowledge of the Bill and can make no statement upon it.

Panama Canal Labour.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many labourers from

Trinidad and other British possessions in the West Indies are now working on the Panama Canal.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Answer given on behalf of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the 15th of May last showed that in September, 1906, over 10,000 men from these islands were at work in the engineering department and earthworks of the canal. I have no later information.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies on what date the Courts decided that the contract entered into between the Commissioners and Trinidad labourers cannot be enforced; and by what Court was the decision pronounced.

MR. CHURCHILL: The decision was, I understand, given by the Supreme Court of the United States of America, but I have at present no precise or official information, and inquiry is being made formally by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Southern Nigerian Concessions.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any information showing that Mr. Brown, a European at Ijebu Ode, Lagos, South Nigeria, has obtained a concession to some 600 square miles of territory from Awujale, the King of Ijebu Ode, for the purpose of cutting mahogany logs; that Awujale and the chiefs repudiate the claim on the ground that the document signed by them merely conceded the right to prospect for timber, with the option after six months of entering into an agreement for cutting rights; that the only money which has passed between the parties is the sum of £20, which was considered to be a return for the hospitality extended to Mr. Brown by Awujale and the chiefs; that the natives, who previously had received licences to cut logs, were deprived of this privilege and of their livelihood, and some of them imprisoned for disputing the right of Mr. Brown; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: Telegraphic information which we have received indicates that the transaction in question is capable of satisfactory explanation; but as it is desirable that the reply should be categorical and complete I would ask my hon. friend to wait until the full report which has been called for arrives by mail.

African Hut Tax.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the amount of the hut tax in East Africa, Central Africa, and Nigeria; whether, if the average family is five persons, it amounts to about six annas per capita; and whether, the present profit on each rupee being more than four annas, he will consider the possibility, by the introduction of these coins on a much larger scale, to substitute for the hut tax the collection of the needed revenue by the seignorage on the rupee currency minted especially for these three districts.

MR. CHURCHILL: In the East Africa Protectorate the rate of the hut tax is three rupees a year, except in the Kenia and Jubaland provinces, which are not yet fully administered, and in which the rate is two rupees. A rate of three rupees is equivalent to nearly ten annas a head for an average family of five persons. In British Central Africa the rate varies from six to twelve shillings a hut according to district. Indian currency is not in use in the Protectorate, and the hon. Member's Question does not, therefore, appear to be relevant to that country. In Nigeria there is no hut tax and Indian currency is not used. With regard to the latter part of the Question, I informed the hon. Member for Hoxton on the 23rd of July that there is no prospect that it will be possible to appropriate for the purposes of the East Africa Protectorate any part of the seignorage on the Indian rupees in circulation. A special subsidiary coinage is being introduced, but the profit on these coins, especially on the lower denominations, will be less than on the rupee, and it is impossible to say what part of this profit, if any, will be available for purposes of revenue. In any case, the existence of the tax does not impose any harsh or severe burden, it is a stimulus to habits of industry and the use of coin, and as no difficulty is experienced in its collection I see no reason for abolishing it.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON was understood to ask who appropriated the revenue arising from the coinage.

MR. CHURCHILL: If any profit is reaped on the coinage of smaller denominations it would be reaped by the revenue of the different Colonies, but the Indian seignorage is rigidly reaped by the Indian Government.

The New Hebrides.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the French contraband trade with the New Hebrides is inflicting injury upon Australian traders with the islands; and whether he can state the present position of affairs with reference to the settlement of this question.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have at present nothing to add to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for Gravesend on last Tuesday.†

Great Britain and Russia.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Sir William Nicholson has come to London for the purpose of consulting about the final draft of a Russian treaty; whether this treaty is to be of a general character or is only to relate to outstanding boundary difficulties, or whether, as in the case of the Anglo-French treaty, arrangements regarding local interests are to cover a general entente and rapprochement; and whether, in coming to any arrangement with Russia, the Secretary of State proposes to take into account the feeling of this country regarding the present relations between the Russian governing authorities and the Russian people.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): It would be quite unusual and most undesirable to make statements as to the special reason for the movements of any ambassadors. With regard to the rest of the hon. Member's Question, if any agreement is made with the Russian Government its terms will be laid before Parliament. My right hon. friend can only repeat the Answer given to the hon. Member on 13th June, in which he said that "the direct object of the negotiations is to prevent conflict and difficulties between the two Powers in the part of Asia which affects the Indian frontier and the Russian frontiers in that region. If the negotiations result in an agreement it will deal only with these questions." The internal affairs of another country cannot be brought into negotiations of this kind. As to the analogy of the Anglo-French agreement, surely it is obvious that the developments to which the hon. Member refers were the result of good feeling and public opinion, which is always free to take its own course, and which cannot be constrained, but which can be, when it chooses, the most effective influence in promoting goodwill between nations.

*MR. REES: May I ask whether the desirability of a general understanding with Great Britain is not the one subject on which the Russian Government and its Russian opponents are agreed?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am afraid I cannot make any statement on the subject.

British Commercial Agents.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether there has been at any time any inquiry into the work of the commercial agents in foreign countries; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of such inquiry.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Departmental Committee on Commercial Intelligence, which reported in 1898, considered among other subjects the commercial work of consular officers in foreign countries. The Report was published in 1898 (C. 8962.) A Departmental Committee on the Consular Service also reported in 1903 (C. D. 1634.) An examination of the system of commercial attachés and agents was made quite recently by a Committee consisting of Sir Eldon Gorst of the Foreign Office and Mr. Llewellyn Smith of the Board of Trade. I have no objection to laying the Report on the Table.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1348–9.

MR. HAROLD COX: Will the hon. Gentleman undertake to have it laid this session, and if possible, before any decision is taken?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I will undertake that the Report shall be laid.

United States Tariff on Works of Art.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether he is yet in a position to state the result of the negotiations which have passed between His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States with reference to the import duty levied in the United States upon British works of art, which is at the rate of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* as compared with 15 per cent. charged upon works of art imported from other European countries.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No, Sir; my right hon. friend is not in a position to make a statement on the subject yet.

London Florists.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what has been the result of the consideration of the grievance of the London florists resulting from the enforcement of the Factory Act in respect of their shops and employees following upon the decision in the case of Hoare v. Green.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): After careful consideration of the representations which I have received from the trade, and of the Report of the inspector, I have informed the trade that I shall be prepared to consider an application for the extension to the trade generally of the special exceptions in Sections 43 and 49 of the Act, but that the requirements of the Act as to non-employment in the workshop of women and young persons on Sunday, and as to the half-holiday being given to all women and young persons in the workshop on the same day must be complied with. As regards these two points I have no power to grant any exemption, and I understand from the inspector's Report that in a number of florists' establishments there is no Sunday employment of women and young persons at present, and that, in the opinion of many florists, the difficulty as to giving the half-holiday on the same day is one that can be overcome.

*MR. REES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that unless the severity of these regulations is mitigated the effect will be the substitution of male foreigners for English women in the trade?

MR. GLADSTONE: The hon. Member has told me so.

Lighthouse Administration.

MR. W. R. REA (Scarborough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he expects to be in a position to lay upon the Table of the House, before the end of the present session, a copy of the Report of the Royal Commission which was appointed last year to inquire into the lighthouse administration of the United Kingdom; and, if not, what is the cause of the delay.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I understand that the Royal Commission in question has just concluded the taking of evidence, but that it is not likely that their Report will be published before the end of the present session.

British Commercial Agents Abroad.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is part of the duty of British commercial agents in foreign countries to supply information which will assist British manufacturers to compete with foreign manufacturers; and whether it will also be the duty of the commercial agents whom it is proposed to send to the Colonies to assist British manufacturers by similar means to compete with Colonial manufacturers.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. With regard to the second part of the Question, it is intended that when commercial agents are appointed in the Colonies, it shall be their duty to do all in their power to supply information which shall be of use to British traders.

MR. HAROLD COX: To enable them to compete with Colonial manufacturers?

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Is it not the case that these commercial agents also enable British manufacturers to compete with foreign manufacturers?

[No Answer was audible.]

British Commercial Agents in the Colonies.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has at any time received any representations from British manufacturers asking for the appointment of Government commercial agents in British Colonies; whether those representations explain what service a Government agent will render which British manufacturers are incapable of procuring for themselves; and, if so, whether he will lay such representations upon the Table of the House.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: In this matter the Board of Trade are acting in consultation with their Commercial Intelligence Committee which is fully representative of British manufacturers, and one of whose principal functions is to advise the Board as to the best methods by which Government action can usefully help British traders by obtaining and circulating commercial information. The subject is too large a one to be discussed in answer to a Question.

Newbury Train Service.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state what is the increase in the number of trains calculated to pass through Newbury during the month of July, 1907, as compared with July, 1897; what addition, if any, has been made to the permanent staff of the station to meet the increased traffic; and whether any fresh accommodation has been provided for passengers at all.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper in the name of the same hon. Member—

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that it is admitted by the Great Western Railway Company that their station at Newbury is fifty-nine years old and has never been enlarged, in spite of the enormously increased traffic caused by the construction of two new connecting lines and the diversion through Newbury of part of the main line traffic; that this traffic has been still further added to during the last two years by the holding of four annual race meetings near Newbury of two days each; that, though the platform is in places only six feet wide, daily expresses run through the station at over fifty miles an hour to the danger of the passengers and traffic; and whether he has been informed that the remonstrances of the Newbury Corporation have been, for eight years, ignored by the company; and whether he will send down an inspector to inquire into the fitness of the station and its arrangements for the existing volume of traffic.

To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the land alleged by the Great Western Railway Company to be necessary before they can build a new station at Newbury has been offered to the company by the trustees of the Newbury Municipal Consolidated Charities for £1,600, and that the company have declined to pay the price; and whether he will inquire why, if the company are not satisfied with the price asked for by the trustees, they do not use the powers placed at their disposal by the law for compulsorily obtaining the land?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The railway company, with whom I have again communicated in this matter, state that they are unable to add anything material to the information already given which has been communicated to my hon. friend. Under the circumstances I have decided to prosecute an inquiry into the matter.

Light Railway Bill.

COLONEL A. GARDNER (Herefordshire, Ross): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that the lapsing of the Light Railway Bill has caused inconvenience and loss in agricultural districts; and if he sees his way to introduce legislation on the subject during the present session.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The continuance of the Light Railways Act of 1896 will be provided for in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, pending the introduction of further legislation on this subject. It has been my intention to deal will this matter in a Bill, but as I can see no chance of getting it through this year, I do not propose introducing it.

Railway Companies and Irish Butter Trade.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to several cases in which butter consigned from Ireland was delayed and damaged in transit, namely, a consignment sent from Castleblaney to the Glasgow depôt, 9, Ingram Street, Glasgow, which arrived on the 18th instant badly damaged and three pounds of the butter lost; fourteen boxes of butter sent from Aylwardstown Station, consigned viâ Dublin and Holyhead to 34, Cumberland Street, Liverpool, delayed, boxes broken, and butter over-heated and soiled; and thirty boxes of butter from Carrick-on-Suir to depôt, Cumberland Street, Liverpool, also consigned viâ Waterford and Liverpool, boxes broken, butter running through them, some quite empty in the sides and hollow in the centre; all those consigned by the Irish Co-operative Agency Society; and whether notice will be taken of this conduct by the railway companies concerned.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have communicated with the railway companies concerned in the land transit of the consignments referred to, and I will inform the hon. Member of the result.

Government Capital.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Board of Trade is systematically collecting and arranging particulars relating to the combination and concentration of capital in the United Kingdom; and, if so, whether there is any intention of presenting an official Report embodying such particulars for the information of the public.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The movements referred to are being carefully watched and noted by the Board of Trade. There is no intention at the present time to publish any Report upon the subject.

Navigation and Shipping Returns.

Mr. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade with reference to the annual statement of the navigation and shipping of the United Kingdom whether the figures of entrances and clearances for each port are prepared on the same basis; whether the figures for Southampton are to be regarded as a complete account of the foreign shipping trade of the port within the limits of the explanation afforded by the introductory notes on page vii.; whether the figures for Dover are enhanced by a different mode of classification; and whether he can give any indication, if the same mode of classification were applied to both Dover and Southampton, as to what difference in the number of vessels and net register tons would be made in the figures

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The figures as to entrances and clearances of shipping are now prepared on the same basis for all ports. Prior to 1907, vessels in the Foreign trade calling at or off a port to land or embark passengers or baggage only, were not included in the returns unless they were brought to at or near the docks or quays of the ports. Thus at Southampton such vessels bringing to below Netley were excluded, while at Dover similar vessels which, as a rule, brought to at or near the piers, were included. Since the beginning of this year all vessels calling at or off the ports to land or embark passengers or baggage have been included, whether brought to at or near the docks or quays or not. The number of vessels "calling off" at Southampton which were excluded from the Returns in 1906 owing to the operation of the rule then in force was 338, with a total net tonnage of 1,222,443 tons. These were all foreign, and the new rule will therefore involve an apparent increase in the tonnage of foreign vessels entered and cleared this year as compared with 1906.

Bermondsey Paupers.

Mr. ALDEN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that between sixty and seventy able-bodied men were turned out of Tanner Street workhouse, Bermondsey, on Wednesday, 17th July, that one being unable to find work has since asked the workhouse officials to admit him and been refused, though destitute; and whether he proposes to take any action in this matter with the object of preventing able-bodied destitute men tramping the streets in this condition.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I understand that the visiting committee recently had a special call-over of the inmates of the Tanner Street workhouse, when 301 inmates were seen. Fifty-two able-bodied men were ordered to take their discharge and seek work, and two were directed to do so when certified to be fit by the medical officer. Leave of absence was given to eight men to seek work, and eight more applied for their discharge. Of these, twenty-six have since applied for orders of readmission to the workhouse and have been readmitted. I understand that in no case has readmission been refused, but the men's statement as to where they have applied for employment is taken down and verified before an order for readmission is given. It does not appear to be necessary that I should take any action in the matter.

Liverpool Guardians and Catholic Poor Law Children.

MR. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the resolution passed unanimously at a conference of Catholic Poor Law guardians, held at Liverpool, appealing to the President of the Local Government Board to take steps to remedy the existing law by which boards of guardians can give away Catholic children to non-Catholic foster-parents, and thus deprive them of the opportunities of practising their religious duties; and can he say what action he intends taking to remedy this grievance.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received a copy of the resolution referred to. I am not sure what the precise class of cases is which had led to the passing of the resolution, and I am making inquiry on the subject. Where a child is boarded out by the guardians, whether within or without the union, the regulations require that the foster-parent shall be of the same religious creed as that to which the child belongs.

Darfield and Low Valley Schools.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what is the accommodation of the mixed elementary school at Darfield; whether the managers of that school refused to admit forty-one girls from Low Valley owing to the school being already filled in excess of its proper accommodation; whether the local education authority of the West Riding instructed the master of the school to disregard the instructions of the managers not to admit such children; and whether a local authority has the right to override any such decision of the managers of a school.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The recognised accommodation of the school referred to is 360. I am informed that the managers of the school passed a resolution refusing admission to the scholars in question and that the local education authority directed that they should be admitted. The local education authority appear to have acted within their rights, and the managers have been so informed.

MR. LANE-FOX: In view of the larger number of attendances, will the right hon. Gentleman not admit that there is overcrowding and that the Roman Catholic school is necessary?

MR. MCKENNA: I must first see the monthly Return.

*MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): Is it a fact that these children were excluded, not by the managers as a body, but by improper action on the part of their clerical correspondent?

MR. MCKENNA asked for notice.

MR. LANE-FOX: Had the local authority any right to override the decision of the managers?

MR. MCKENNA: It acted within its rights.

Elementary Schools.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is prepared, in respect to the special grant of £100,000 for building elementary schools, which was expressly forbidden by the Education Act of 1870, to apply the rule imposed by Parliament upon the only grant possible under that Act, and embody the conditions under which the special grant may be earned in a Minute which shall not have force until it has lain for not less than one month upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament.

MR. MCKENNA: No, Sir.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): So far as I understand the Answer, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would allow me to ask a supplementary Question, as the matter is important. He proposes to give a grant contrary to the Act of 1870. He proposes, in giving that grant, which even if it was legal would have to be granted under conditions laid down in the Minute, to absolve himself both from the general provisions of the Act and from the provisions requiring a Minute. Is that not so?

MR. MCKENNA: No, Sir; the right hon. Gentleman is mistaken on every point.

SIR HENRY CRAIK: Might I ask if it is not the case that such limited building grants as are permitted under the Act of 1870 were not to be embodied in Code or Minute, solely for the reasons that the Act itself laid down precisely the conditions under which these grants were to be paid, and that where the Act did not lay down such conditions they were, as in the case of annual Parliamentary grants, imposed by the Code? Having now——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is exceeding the limits of a Question.

SIR HENRY CRAIK: I ask whether it is not the case that the conditions of a building grant were not to be laid down in a Minute solely for the reason that the Act itself lays down the conditions.

MR. MCKENNA: That is a historical inquiry into the circumstances under which the Act of 1870 was passed. I must have notice of such a Question.

Caithness and Orkney Mails.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the train conveying mails to the counties of Caithness and Orkney is almost invariably late in the tourist and shooting season, and that, in consequence, the mail steamer often is compelled to undertake the passage in the dark; if the railway company is under contract with the Government; and, if so, what is the stipulated time for mail trains to arrive at Thurso and Wick.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.; for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): It is a fact that the mail train to the North of Scotland is frequently late during the tourist season; and in reply to remonstrances on the subject, the railway company have represented the difficulty of maintaining punctuality on a railway with a single line of rails at a time when the passenger traffic is greatly in excess of the normal amount. The train, which is run under contract, should arrive at Thurso at 3.35 p.m., and at Wick at 3.50 p.m. The mail steamer to Orkney has, even when the train is punctual, to make the passage after dark during the greater part of the year.

Telegraph Messengers.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if the Post Office are prepared to retain in their employment at the Post Office those boys who would in the ordinary course be discharged at the age of sixteen, until the age of eighteen, if they are willing to enlist in the Regular Army; and whether the Post Office will guarantee that on discharge from the colours, physically fit and with a good character, re-employment in the Post Office will be found for those thus enlisted.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): If a scheme of the kind suggested by the hon. Member could be devised, which would be purely voluntary and free from the objections attending former schemes of the same kind, it would assist in solving the problem of the further employment of telegraph messengers. My right hon. friend is not, however, at present prepared to put forward such a scheme.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT inquired if Mr. A. H. Norton, an official of the Post Office, who gave evidence before the Committee on Employment for ex-Soldiers, spoke for himself or for the Post Office.

MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

National Telephone Charges at Kendal.

MR. STEWART-SMITH (Westmoreland, Kendal): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the proposal of the National Telephone Company to impose a charge of 1d. for all calls between the several exchanges of the Kendal area is said to be with the approval of the Postmaster-General; if so, when was this approval given; and was the Postmaster-General aware that in commencing business in the Kendal district the National Telephone Company have specifically committed themselves in writing to the secretary of the chamber of commerce to give a free service between all exchanges within that district.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): So long as the National Telephone Company's charges are within the limits fixed by the schedule to the agreement of 2nd February, 1905, my right hon. friend's consent is not necessary for any modifications of tariff. His consent has not been asked for or given for any special charges in the Kendal area, and he has no reason to think that the charges there exceed the agreed maximum. The matter referred to in the last paragraph of the Question does not appear to be one in which he can intervene.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) inquired if the fact that the company committed itself in writing to the chamber of commerce to give a free service, and that it was now varying the agreement, did not justify the Post Office in interfering?

CAPTAIN NORTON: No, it is a matter between the chamber and the company.

Imprisonment for Debt.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General what steps he proposes to take in order to carry out the Resolution of the House of the 20th March last, that the present powers of committing to prison for non-payment of debt ought to be restricted.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): No legislation can be introduced this session.

Worcester Election Petition.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General if it is now finally decided that the Crown shall undertake no prosecutions against persons concerned in the recent trial at Worcester under the Corrupt Practices Act.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Before the hon. and learned Gentleman answers may I ask whether, as these people have been sufficiently punished by the shame and notoriety of the offence, he does not regard it as consistent with his duty to take no further proceedings against them, seeing that far greater Parliamentary offences, such as the sale and purchase of peerages, are allowed to pass with impunity.

SIR JOHN WALTON: The hon. Member is apparently under the impression that no prosecutions were brought in consequence of the Report drawn up on this matter. Five prosecutions were instituted. Of these one was withdrawn, and four cases were brought before the Grand Jury. The Bill against one defendant was thrown out, leaving three defendants to be tried before a jury. They all put in pleas of "Guilty." We do not propose to institute any further prosecutions.

Shetland Herring Stations.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been called to the fact that in Shetland forty-eight herring stations are now represented by nine, 866 boats by forty-five, and that wide-spread alarm exists throughout the entire country; if he is aware that the Norwegians drove the whale killers from their country on the ground that the herring industry was being ruined; and if he has any official Reports showing that the herring industry has recovered in Norway since the whale killers were driven off; and whether he proposes to take any measures to restore confidence to the fishermen.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): My hon. friend does not give the years to which his figures apply, and it has not therefore been possible to verify his statement. There is some concern in regard to this matter, but, so far as I am aware, there is no reason to suppose that that concern is general. The prohibition against whaling by the Norwegian Government affected certain districts only, and my information is that no appreciable improvement in the produce of the fisheries has resulted. I may add that the fishing on the East Coast of Scotland this season has been extremely successful, while the total catch for Shetland is now only 8,000 crans short of last year. The Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill which is now before the House contains proposals for the regulation of that industry, and I earnestly hope that Parliament may see fit to pass it into law this session.

Medical Relief in the Highlands.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware of the fact that the Congested Districts Board are precluded from in any way assisting the poor people of the Highlands and Islands in respect of medical and nursing assistance; that there are islands and districts far distant from any possible medical and nursing assistance; and whether, in view of the fact that the position of the Congested Districts Board is now under consideration, he will consider the desirability of extending their powers or the powers of any body that may succeed them.

MR. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend is correct in stating that the existing powers of the Board as conferred by Parliament do not extend to the purposes referred to. I am aware that the resources of the authorities responsible for public health in certain districts are slender, but I do not think that extension of powers to the Congested Districts Board is the best way of meeting the difficulty.

Orkney and the Small Landowners Bill.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been directed to a petition from the hundreds of small owners in Orkney whose rental is under £50 (the limit of the Small Landowners Bill); and if, in view of the fact that the business, profession, or trade of those small owners is seriously threatened by the Small Landowners Bill and that the Government recognise the serious nature of their petition, he will state what steps the Government propose to take to reassure those persons that their living will not be endangered.

MR. SINCLAIR: A petition signed by about eighty persons was received praying that no tenant should get fixity of tenure whose proprietor owns no more land than is worth £50 a year. The Government will consider whether, with a view to meeting such case, it will be possible in the Small Landholders Bill to give statutory recognition of the principle accepted by the Crofter Commission in the case of Slater *v.* Esslemont where the proprietrix of a croft desired, and was allowed, to resume possession thereof in order personally to reside in and occupy the same.

The Official Debates.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the widely differing opinions of Members of this House on the subject, he will undertake that no final decision will be taken on the Report of the Committee on Parliamentary Debates until some opportunity has been afforded for discussion, or some effort has been made to ascertain the general sense of the House thereon.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): My hon. friend may be satisfied that no precipitate steps will be taken in this matter and that we shall endeavour to ascertain the feelings of the House.

Army Bill—Lords' Amendments.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will say when will the Lords' Amendments to the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill be put down for consideration by this House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot yet fix a day.

MR. ASHLEY: Will it be this week?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have said I cannot fix a day.

London Bills.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it would be possible to make arrangements by which an amount of time might be devoted to legislation for the special needs of the 6,000,000 of people in London which would more closely approximate that devoted to Scottish and Irish legislation; and whether arrangements can be made whereby important London measures, such as the Water Bill, shall come before the House for discussion before 11 o'clock p.m.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am well aware that the measures specially affecting London have not had their fair proportion of time this year, but I hope that that will not be so in future.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he thinks it at all probable that three important subjects affecting London—namely, the traffic question, the Port of London question, and the electric light question—will be dealt with next session?

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Can you not arrange to give the English a Parliament to themselves?

[No Answer was returned.]

Scottish Local Veto Bill.

MR. LAIDLAW: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if, in view of the disappointment felt by a section of the people of Scotland at the failure of the Government to introduce temperance legislation this year, he will meet the earnest wishes of a great majority of the Scottish Members and introduce a Local Veto Bill for Scotland in the early part of next session.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid I cannot make any promise in this matter. I greatly regret that the private Member's Bill for this purpose which was so fortunate in its introduction has been crushed out this session.

Committee on Post Office Servants.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, with reference to the Report of the Select Committee on Post Office Servants, whether, in view of the fact that the Committee have presented to the House a number of recommendations without fully giving their reasons in some intances, as, for example, paragraph 331 recommending low rates of pay for the 7,700 London postmen, he will afford an early opportunity for the discussion of the Report to enable the House to become better aquainted with the reasons entertained by the Committee for recommending low wages.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Select Committee on Post Office Servants was representative of all Parties in the House; and, as the House recognises, went most exhaustively and carefully into the question set before them of the adequacy or otherwise of the remuneration paid to Post Office servants. The Committee have now reported for the consideration of the Government the conclusions at which they have arrived, and the Government will give the recommendations of the Committee the most careful and detailed examination. No advantage will be gained by the discussion of the Report by the House at this stage, nor, as my hon. friend must see, would there be any time for such a discussion this session.

Blocking Motions.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he contemplates securing the assent of the House this session to the recommendations of the Select Committee on Anticipatory Motions, which enlist the sympathy of all sections of the House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That must depend entirely upon the feeling of the House. Provided we can come to an agreement on the matter unanimously and without discussion, I see no reason why a Standing Order giving effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee should not be adopted.

LORD R. CECIL: What steps does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take in order to arrive at an agreement?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The usual steps. I do not think there will be much difficulty about that.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): Do not the usual steps consist of standing still?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is sometimes the wisest thing to do.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, as a matter of fact, he intends to take any steps in order to arrive at an agreement?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think the hon. Member ought to ask me that.

Public Accounts Committee.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can state when the discussion of the Reports presented by the Public Accounts Committee will be taken.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot yet say. I am afraid it will be in the last days of the session.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked if the Prime Minister could so re-arrange the business of the House for Tuesday that the motion for the proposed grant to Lord Cromer might be taken as the first Order of the day. He believed it was without precedent that a motion of great importance, brought forward in consequence of a Royal message, should be taken otherwise than as the first Order. There would be a corresponding Motion in the House of Lords, and as the Finance Bill was assumed to have precedence over all other Bills he was afraid it must come first in the exceptional circumstances.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN did not think he could depart from the arrangement which had been arrived at. There would be a corresponding Motion relating to Lord Cromer's grant in the House of Lords, and therefore the Government could not postpone the Motion in the Commons. The Finance Bill was assumed to take precedence of all other measures, and he was afraid it must be taken first on Tuesday.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked at what hour the Motion was likely to be reached.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN did not think the discussion on the Finance Bill would take very long, and therefore the Motion should be reached at an early period of the evening.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked whether, as the grant to Lord Cromer was a money matter, the Motion concurring in the grant should not be deferred in the House of Lords until the House of Commons had come to a decision on the question. This was done in the case of the grant to Lord Kitchener in 1899.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is exceeding the limits of a Question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Then, may I address the Question to you, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I have no control over the House of Lords.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN pointed out that the Government were following the practice pursued in former cases.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But in the case of the Kitchener Grant the Lords' Motion was deferred for three days by Lord Salisbury on the ground that the Commons must take the initiative.

PUBLIC HEALTH (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 276.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 276.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee and on re-committal), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 293.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEE).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C: Mr. Dolan.

Report to lie upon the Table.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) moved that the Bill be re-committed to a Select Committee. A great deal more evidence and information was, he said, necessary before the House could agree to pass the measure. They had already finished the Committee Stage of the Bill, and so far as he could gather from what passed during the discussion, the only argument the Government could put forward was that of urgency. That might or might not be a good argument, but he wished to complain strongly of the very small amount of evidence the Government had brought forward in defence of the Bill. The reason for the Bill seemed an entirely sentimental one on the part of the Irish Secretary who, having failed to pass the Irish Council Bill, was determined to pass some sort of Irish measure this session. However that might be, the House was most certainly entitled to more information than that which had been afforded either by the report of the Estates Commissioners or by the Attorney-General and the Irish Secretary. In the first place they ought to know how these 2,000 tenants were made up. They were led to understand that in 1903 only 600 to 800 tenants were to be provided for. Now they were told that the number had increased to 2,000. They had been refused point blank any particulars with regard to the list. The Irish Secretary had urged that such information would entail a great deal of work upon the Estates Commissioners, but his reply to that was that all the information was at present in the Estates Commissioners office in tabulated form, and that all that was needed was to present it to the House in the form of a Parliamentary Paper. They also required that they should have further information as to the methods to be adopted by the Estates Commissioners in settling the price to be paid per acre for the farms which they acquired compulsorily. There was also an important question as to how the grass-lands to be acquired were to be valued. Two possible views had been indicated, one that the landlord who was compelled to sell his grass-lands should receive for them at least the full market value, and the other that the price should be what they would fetch if subject to a judicial rent. Where the grass-lands were subject to a judicial rent they would fetch 20s., 25s., and at the outside 30s. an acre, whereas when let on the eleven months system they were worth £2 to £4 an acre. That meant a great difference to the landlord, and it was a point upon which they should have some definite information. There was nothing laid down in the Bill as to the way in which these lands were to be valued. There ought to be more information than had been supplied as to the disparity between the number of tenants to be reinstated and the number they all thought would have to be reinstated to clear up the matter. Information was also required showing that the Commissioners had really used all the powers they possessed to acquire land voluntarily before they resorted to compulsion. He claimed that their Report did not show that. There was a bald statement that so many acres would be required for the purposes of the Act, and also that application made to a certain number of landlords had not produced up to the present any very great effect.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) asked whether the hon. Member was in order in speaking on the merits of the Bill, the real question being whether it should be recommitted to a Select Committee.

MR. SPEAKER said he gathered that the argument of the hon. Member was that before the House debated the Bill further it required further information, and that that information could only be obtained by sending it to a Select Committee which could call evidence. That was the only line of argument open to the hon. Member, and he must confine himself to that.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he thought he had been doing that. He was trying to show that it would be beneficial to the House to have evidence from the Commissioners and other persons to show that all efforts had been made to acquire the land necessary to carry out the Act. It was stated in the Report that the Commissioners had been able to acquire 80,000 acres for the purpose of reinstating tenants, and in the view of the Committee on Congestion it was required for that purpose. It was a point on which the House of Commons should ask for information whether the urgency of this evicted tenants question was not such that the 80,000 acres already acquired was not sufficient for the purpose. He submitted that no urgency had been shown for the Bill, and that before urgency could be accepted as the reason for it the House should have evidence from other persons besides the Chief Secretary. The Commissioners themselves and their innumerable inspectors engaged in the work could give very valuable information in that respect. The Chief Secretary's arguments had been entirely confined to the urgency of the measure. The proper way, therefore, was to recommit the Bill to a Select Committee who could examine not only the Commissioners and inspectors, evicted tenants and landlords in the West of Ireland, but generally the numerous persons who might be in many respects adversely affected by the Bill.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said that if ever there was an occasion on which a Bill should be recommitted the present was one. There never was a Bill so gagged as this one had been or where discussion had been so stifled. He thought he was correct in saying that only three clauses had been discussed, and he was quite sure that the Chief Secretary would admit there had been absolutely no obstruction but simply a desire to debate points and assist the Government. His hon. friend was fully justified in saying that this was one of the most revolutionary measures ever brought into the House. The fact that there had been practically no discussion whatever showed there was all the more need for re-examination before these unhappy people who had been in some cases more than a quarter of a century in their farms were turned out to make way for other tenants. There was nothing in the Bill to show what tribunal would carry out these evictions, and the fact that a number of men were coming from America and Australia, in fact from the ends of the earth, to claim possession of these farms which had been in possession of their present tenants in some cases for a quarter of a century, showed distinctly that there ought to be a very clear discussion as to what this tribunal should be, and a more thorough examination of the measure. The Bill would sow discord and, he believed, paralyse the agricultural industry by hanging an uncertain fate over the unfortunate present tenants, and that was an important reason why that and so many other important points should receive fuller discussion. He accordingly seconded the Motion for recommittal.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be recommitted to a Select Committee."—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said it was conceivable that there might be occasions when it would be proper on the Report Stage to move that a Bill should be recommitted to a Select Committee, but he submitted that the present was not such an occasion. The effect of carrying the motion would be clearly dilatory. The hon. Member had said there was no urgency for this Bill. How far he was in order in saying that he was not sure. It had been further stated that the Bill was brought forward for the purpose of soothing his wounded pride because of the unfavourable reception which the Irish Council Bill received at the hands of the Irish representatives. Anyone who knew the circumstances would know that the Bill was brought in on account of a distinct pledge given before the Council Bill was introduced. He obtained permission from the Treasury to increase the staff of inspectors for the very purpose of being able to form something like a definite opinion as to the number of evicted tenants who would require to be dealt with. Accordingly as soon as that work was done, this Bill became an absolute necessity, a fulfilment of a definite Parliamentary pledge given by himself, and also by his right hon. friend who preceded him in office. Therefore, there was no association whatever between the introduction of this Bill and the reception given to the Irish Council Bill. This Bill would have been introduced even if the Irish Council Bill had not been introduced, or if, having been introduced, it had been proceeded with. The hon. Member had said that he wanted more information, but he would surely admit that the question had been argued and re-argued whether the number of evicted tenants was 2,000 more or less. They had dealt with that until he was nearly tired of giving the information, though he might not have satisfied the hon. Member's mind. In regard to another point, the hon. Member had said that there was a difference in the price per acre according as the land was used for one purpose or another. That might be a good ground for an Amendment to be introduced into the Bill, but it was no ground for its recommital to a Select Committee. Another point stated by the hon. Member was that there was no evidence before the House that the Estates Commissioners had taken all the steps they could to acquire land for the purpose of reinstating the evicted tenants without compulsion at all. It had been suggested that it might be sufficient if they were allowed to acquire the land voluntarily. He submitted that that was a matter which the Government must take the responsibility of deciding upon. He had no desire to say that all the Commissioners were agreed on this point. He understood that Mr. Commissioner Wrench, for example, was of opinion that compulsory powers were not necessary. He did not, and never had, based himself on the evidence or the Report of the Commissioners. The Government was satisfied that this question had stood over long enough, and that unless steps were taken to enable the Estates Commissioners, or other persons who might be entrusted with the job, to acquire land in a short space of time, by compulsion if necessary, the question would hang fire for the next five or six years as it had hung fire in the past. He did not know what the Second Reading of a Bill was for if it was not to determine questions of that sort. The House of Commons determined on the Second Reading that that was not an unreasonable thing to be demanded. To ask that on the Report stage the Bill should be recommitted, or, in other words, that their labour was to be thrown away, was playing with the House. The hon. Member for North Down had said the Bill had not been properly discussed in Committee. He quite agreed that it had not been properly discussed, but whose fault was that? If they were going to say that they would never discuss properly a Bill put through by closure by compartments, if the Opposition said the House was insulted by closure by compartment, then of course they understood one another.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said that after the first day the right hon. Gentleman would admit that there had been no obstruction.

MR. BIRRELL said he was quite prepared to leave that to the sense of the House. If after the first day the Bill could have been dealt with in the course of three or four days, then he agreed that closure by compartments would have been quite unnecessary. The Government might have been mistaken in the spirit with which the Bill had been received, but they considered that they had given ample time for the discussion of every important clause. He quite agreed that as it turned out some of the clauses had not been sufficiently discussed, but if they could not discuss a Bill of this sort in three days then there was an end to all Parliamentary discussion. If they had not had ample time to discuss the Bill in Committee, that was all the more reason why they should not waste any further time in dilatory motions.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that when the right hon. Gentleman accused his friend behind him of pursuing dilatory tactics he came perilously near coming under his own condemnation, because everybody knew that if the Irish Council Bill had been proceeded with there would have been no time for the discussion of this or any other measure unless the House had sat till Christmas. The right hon. Gentleman must have been speaking in a vein of sarcasm when he talked about the House coming to the conclusion that the tactics of his hon. friends behind him were of an obstructive character. The right hon. Gentleman knew that the House consisted of the Unionist and Nationalist Members from Ireland, himself and one of his colleagues, and two other hon. Members. That was the jury by whom the tactics of the Unionists were to be tried—that was to say they were to be tried by their political opponents.

Mr. BIRRELL said there were not many of his political opponents present. The opposition was almost entirely from two or three hon. Gentleman opposite.

Mr. WALTER LONG said that that was a fair proportion. The right hon. Gentleman had declared the Motion to be one which ought not to have been made, and had asked how it could have been made after the Second Reading, on which the principles of the Bill had been accepted. The Chief Secretary apparently entirely ignored the fact that some of the Amendments proposed by the Opposition during the Committee stage would have had a safeguarding or limiting effect on the Bill. He did not expect that his opponents would agree that some of those Amendments were absolutely fair and reasonable and ought to have been accepted by the Government if they really meant what they said as to the way in which the Bill was to be carried out. If the right hon. Gentleman had accepted the Amendment limiting the powers of the Estates Commissioners and the time during which they were to be exercised, there would not have been a necessity for a Motion of this kind. Some fuller evidence, he contended, ought to be given to the House as to the principles on which the Bill was to be applied. Whatever information the right hon. Gentleman had, he had never condescended to give it to the House. The principles referred to by his hon. friend were as to buying land worth £3 or £4 an acre at a price of £1 an acre. He did not wonder that his hon. friend had made that Motion. As to the reference to the time taken up for discussion, if there had been any attempt to repeat the points on which they had raised discussion, not on the principle of the Bill, but merely on the limitation, there would have been some grounds for complaint. As it was he submitted there were no good grounds for such complaints on the part of the right hon. Gentleman. His contention was there was no justification for powers so drastic to be given to the Estates Commissioners. If that was in order to do what the Government wished, namely, to reinstate a sufficient number of evicted tenants, that could have been done with a much more moderate measure than the present one.

Mr. T. M. HEALY desired to leave it on record as an historic fact that in the long course of years in which the Irish Party had been necessarily in antagonism to the Tory Party, and even to the Liberal Party, no Motion of this kind had ever been made by the Nationalists on the Report stage of any Bill. They were opposed to the Arms Bill and all the Coercion Bills passed by that House, but they had never made a dilatory Motion of this kind. He believed that it had been made by another Party once within thirty years. He thought that it was of some importance as justifying the respect shown to Parliamentary forms and the position of the House by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway to state that no Motion parallel to this had ever been made by them.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) wished to support the Motion for reasons which he thought were reasonable and strong.

*Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby), on a point of order, asked what, seeing that the House had decided to finish the Report stage that evening, would be the position of the House if this Motion was carried. Would they have the means of compelling the Select Committee to make their Report that day so that the Report stage might be taken at 10.30, as the House had already determined on the Motion of the Prime Minister?

Mr. SPEAKER said it was obvious that if the Motion was carried there was an end of the Bill for this session. He could not help Motions being made; several might be made which would put an end to the Bill. He could not object to a Motion when it had been moved.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said that it had been made pretty clear that the action for closuring discussion of the Bill by compartments had been taken for the convenience of the Government. It was necessary to assist the Government in carrying out their programme.

The Chief Secretary surely did not expect the Opposition to have much sympathy with that line of argument. The right hon. Gentleman knew that his Bill was hanging fire. It ought to hang fire a good deal longer; and the right hon. Gentleman could not expect Members on that side of the House to sacrifice what they believed to be the cause of justice and fair play because the Bill was hanging fire. There ran through every line of the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman on almost every clause the suggestion that the House should take the Bill because he placed unlimited trust in the Estates Commissioners and that the Bill would be best administered by them. He was in direct conflict with the right hon. Gentleman. He did not trust the Estates Commissioners. This was not personal to the Commissioners themselves. He did not know and had never exchanged a word with any of them; and he did not impugn their sense of honour or their knowledge. He thought their position was absolutely impossible and they ought not to be in it. He knew quite well that the retort of the right hon. Gentleman would be that these gentlemen had been appointed by the late Government; but that did not preclude him from saying that that action was a mistake. The Commission ought to have been on the lines of the Charity Commission or of a Government Department, by whose action the Government would stand or fall. He believed that the constitution of the Commission was unconstitutional. In the second place he did not believe in the Commissioners or place any confidence in them, because of the language which they themselves had used in connection with some of the points in the Bill. That ought to be borne in mind when the House was putting the liberties, the property, and the amenities of life of the owners of that property absolutely under the heel of those gentlemen. He believed that there was a further intention on the part of the Government——

MR. SPEAKER said he did not see how the observations of the right hon. Gentleman were pertinent to the Motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said he wanted the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee, which would take notice that the powers to be granted to the Estates Commissioners would be destructive of different classes of property, and put the owners under the heel of the Commissioners. He felt very strongly on this point. He had taken the trouble to read up what the Commissioners had said in regard to the way in which certain tenants had been treated, and he wished to show that these gentlemen were likely to do what was wrong.

MR. SPEAKER remarked that if the confidence of the right hon. Gentleman had been destroyed, he did not think there was any hope of its being restored by further examination of the subject by a Select Committee.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said his confidence might be restored by a future discussion. His distrust was, he thought, justified.

MR. SPEAKER said the right hon. and gallant Member's remarks were not relevant to the Motion for the appointment of a Select Committee. The point the hon. Member was raising could be dealt with on a future day on another part of the Bill.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said he wished frankly to lay before the House the reasons why he thought the Commissioners ought not to be entrusted with the carrying out of this Bill. That might not be the right season to raise the question, and if it was not, he immediately gave way, but by the evidence which had been printed and made public, it appeared that the Commissioners had absolutely departed from the position they ought to have taken up.

MR. SPEAKER did not think the remarks of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman were relevant to the Motion before the House. He could attack the Commissioners at a later stage of the Bill.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said he would in that case raise the question at the right time, and it would knock the bottom and substance out of the Bill, if it was to be a measure of justice and was not brought forward merely to sustain the reputation of His Majesty's Government.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 51; Noes, 249. (Division List No. 331.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Ashley, W. W.
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHn. A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hon. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Salter Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. Lonsdale.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith,Rt.HonHerbertHenry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Prcy (Bedford)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry,RedmondJ.(Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dewar,SirJ.A.(Inderness-sh.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea,HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.

Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J.R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pikersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, W.) moved a new clause giving the Estates Commissioners power to acquire land subject to an annuity by agreement. He explained that he had been induced to leave out words which would refer back to the Irish Land Act of 1903 as amended by this Bill, because he understood they would create difficulty in the way of Estates Commissioners getting rid of the new tenants, which it seemed would be necessary in order to restore the evicted tenants in every case. The evicted tenants were now said to amount to 2,000 in number, and it seemed that under this provision it would be necessary to get rid of the new tenant in every case. In some cases no doubt it would be difficult to do so, but if this clause was enacted the Estates Commissioners would be very easily able to get lands upon an estate in the neighbourhood for the evicted tenants and provide them with new farms. For these reasons he thought he should have the support of hon. Members above the gangway. Hon. Members ought to view this clause with considerable favour, because if the annuity for the redemption of the farm had been paid up for fifteen or sixteen years it could be acquired more cheaply than on terms which could be procured now. It would enable the Estates Commissioners to deal more generously with new tenants and also with the evicted tenants. There was no available untenanted land throughout the length and breadth of the counties of Waterford, Cork, or Tipperary to provide for the evicted tenants unless they evicted the new tenants in every case. The men, however, when offered better farms in county Meath preferred to stick to their own county. They preferred a farm on the mountains and highlands of Waterford rather than one on the plains of Meath. If a part of the annuity had been paid off he did not see why they should not save the Treasury money.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) seconded, and urged the difficulty of securing lands in localities suitable for evicted tenants. He need hardly point to the difficulty of securing untenanted land unless some provision of this sort was made. It was very great, and from the Treasury point of view he thought some inexpensive way under which the land could be acquired should be devised. It was impossible to acquire untenanted land without a large expenditure as to buildings being entered upon, but under the Amendment, if an inspector was sent down to look after the buildings and found them suitable to the farm, a good deal of trouble and expense would be avoided. His hon. friends around him had not the least desire that the Estates Commissioners should come into competition with those who might put up the prices. If their inspector had visited a farm, and that farm could be obtained at a reasonable price, what they said was that it would be judicious and wise that the Commissioners should acquire it. In his own parish there was a farm with excellent buildings which could be obtained and would be suitable for the evicted tenants; and there were three other farms which could also be acquired. It would be deplorable if the chance of obtaining those farms was allowed to slip, and the evicted tenants had to be sent at greater expense to some other county. Technicalities stood in the way which it was the object of this proposed clause to remove, and if it were adopted the Estates Commissioners must be prepared to have as little red-tape in the transaction as possible, because the men who were prepared to sell their farms wanted the money almost immediately. Some of them were gentlemen farmers who found that farming involved a loss; one other case which he had in his mind was that of an old and feeble man who was anxious to get rid of his holding at a reasonable figure. If this proposal were adopted, and the money for the farms were not paid as soon as possible, land grabbers with their money ready would try to get those places which were so desirable for the evicted tenants. Some of the planters, who knew very little about farming, and who were now liable for instalments, were prepared to give up their farms upon reasonable conditions, and he sincerely hoped that the Government would not lose this opportunity of dealing with the matter in the cheapest way. There was no compulsion in the clause; it was merely to enable the Commissioners, if, through their inspectors, they learned that certain farms were available at prices which represented their value, to give those sums. In several cases the Commissioners had reported that land was for sale on terms which gave ample value, but owing to technicalities which stood in the way the Commissioners were incompetent to acquire the land except by a process which was unsuitable and expensive to the people concerned. He hoped the case they had made out would commend itself to the Government and the Treasury, because so far from its involving additional cost it would be very much cheaper for the land to be acquired in the way suggested than by the more expensive process.

New Clause—

"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in Section 9 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, the Estates Commissioners may acquire by agreement, for the purposes of this Act, any land which is subject to an annuity under the Land Purchase Acts or the Irish Land Act of 1903, and they may create an additional annuity repayable out of such land provided that they are satisfied that the security for the repayment thereof is sufficient."

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that if hon. Members on those benches thought that the proposed new section would be voluntary in its operation they would have no objection to it, but they did not take that view. So far as the wording of the section was concerned it was undoubtedly voluntary, but they had too much knowledge of what went on in Ireland to think that compulsory methods would not be employed quite outside the section. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment informed them that ever since the Act of 1903 he had done his best to get the evicted tenants reinstated on the farms from which they had been evicted, and would continue to do so. It was for that very reason that they had considerable doubts about such an Amendment as this, and would vote against it. In Galway and Roscommon if land was purchased through the Commissioners by a tenant, then simply because the surrounding tenants for one reason or another thought it was too much, the United Irish League would call upon the owner of the farm to surrender it; exactly the same thing would happen under this clause. In Waterford and other counties precisely the same class of agitation had been started, and if this clause was included pressure would be brought to bear from all sides on these men by local branches of the United Irish League to surrender their holdings because the original holder ought to be reinstated. It was perfectly futile to tell the House that it was a voluntary provision. It would be easy for hon. Members in conjunction with the United Irish League to coerce these unfortunate men into leaving their farms.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the clause had no reference to planters who had bought their holdings.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he believed it would include planters, and he and his friends had the strongest objection to any further powers being given to the Estates Commissioners. They felt that pressure would be brought to bear on these people, and they would oppose the Amendment.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said the hon. Member for South Antrim was in some confusion as to the meaning of the clause. His whole speech was framed as if the Amendment was dealing with farms which had been taken by and subsequently sold to planters, and he had said that if they put in a clause of this kind pressure would be brought to bear on the planters to sell their farms. The clause did not apply to them at all. It was a general clause, and its natural operation had been going on ever since land purchase was started. Men who had purchased their farms and had not completed their annuities for some reason or other wished to sell their farms, which came into the open market. The clause simply provided that the Estates Commissioners might come in and buy such farms for the purpose of this Bill.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the hon. Member for West Waterford had said that in 279 cases of applications no less than ninety were cases of planters.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he had not understood him to say anything of the kind. But if he had, how was that any answer to his point? If any ordinary tenant purchasers in Waterford desired to sell, why should the Estates Commissioners be precluded from going into the open market and buying that farm for the purpose of this Bill? All that his hon. friend said about the tenants in Waterford was that there was no untenanted land to be obtained there, and that unless compulsory powers were put in the Bill none of the evicted tenants could get back. This clause would provide a voluntary means to some extent of providing land for these men. It was extremely hard to please hon. Members above the gangway. When a compulsory clause was asked for they were up in arms, and when a voluntary clause was proposed they said they would vote against it. The only possible explanation of that attitude was that those Members did not want the question settled at all. If they wanted the question settled, and objected to compulsion, why did they not vote for this clause? Their attitude was entirely inconsistent, and he hoped the House would take notice of it. He sincerely hoped the Attorney-General would accept the clause? He thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to accept it. He might say it was a matter for the Treasury, but that was no answer. If it was an answer, where were the Treasury officials? The clause had been on the Paper for some days, and if it was a matter for the Treasury they ought to be present to explain their objections. He could not imagine what objection the Treasury would have to the clause, because its effect would be undoubtedly to save money for the State without any risk. He hoped the Attorney-General would give the House his opinion on the merits of the clause.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) said it was unfortunate that this provision which his hon. friend now proposed was not inserted in the Act of 1903, for it would have saved a considerable amount to the British taxpayer. He was personally aware of cases in which planters had been most willing and anxious to sell, and their holdings could have been obtained for comparatively small sums, for the purpose of restoring the evicted tenants. But the Commissioners were unable to deal with them, and in some cases they had supplied land to the evicted tenants and had spent large sums on buildings and equipments, with considerable loss to the Treasury. He was afraid that owing to the puffing of these planters by hon. Members above the gangway the Estates Commissioners would find that the price of their land had gone up; still, even under those circumstances, he thought his hon. friend's proposal would be a considerable gain to the Treasury.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said he was fully in sympathy with the arguments used by hon. Members below the gangway on this point. There was a great deal to be said in favour of voluntary purchase, but when the matter was considered carefully he did not think hon. Members would be inclined to press this Amendment. There was a financial objection to the proposal which could not be got over. This was an Irish question and meant the loss of money to Ireland. The security for the advances under the Act of 1891 was carefully provided for by Section 9, which laid down that in no case was an additional advance to be made for the purchase of a holding until the whole of the previous advance had been repaid. That provision had been rigorously applied to all sales and it was absolutely necessary to maintain it in its entirety. This Amendment would enable the Estates Commissioners to create an additional annuity. He understood that the hon. Member's proposal was that the State should make the advance for the purchase not only of the landlords' interest, but also the interest of the tenant. The advances were purely to purchase the landlords' interest.

MR. O'SHEE said the Attorney-General was absolutely wrong. When they were acquiring untenanted land at a certain price to the landlord and the evicted tenant came in as well, they added that to the price they gave the landlord and made out an annuity for the whole amount.

MR. CHERRY said he was not aware of that, but what the hon. Member said as regarded untenanted land had nothing to do with the matter, because it was in quite a different position. The Amendment really proposed to charge a fresh annuity, and thus they would start with two annuities instead of one. That was a transaction which they could not accept.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) said it was rather curious that the Attorney-General did not yet know the powers of the Estates Commissioners. Apparently he was absolutely ignorant of the everyday procedure of those Commissioners when dealing with evicted tenants. It was a notorious fact known to everybody who had had anything to do with the reinstatement of evicted tenants that where the Estates Commissioners purchased untenanted land for the purpose of reinstating tenants they made a loan and also a free grant to the tenant who was to be put on to the holding. The free grant, of course, carried no interest or percentage, but if they advanced £500 to the evicted tenants they would give him £200 as a free grant and £300 as a loan. Of course the loan would be added to the purchase money which they paid to the landlord, and if the price to be paid to the landlord was £1,000 and the free grant was £300 the tenant would be charged interest upon £1,300. That transaction appeared to be new to the Attorney-General who had stated that the Estates Commissioners had no power whatever to make any arrangement by which the Treasury were to receive an annuity which would exceed 3¼ per cent. on the amount they had paid for the untenanted land.

MR. CHERRY said he did not state anything of the kind. What he said was that the Estates Commissioners had no power to charge a second annuity on land which was at present liable to an annuity.

MR. KILBRIDE said the Attorney-General stated that under the Act of 1891 it was necessary that the outstanding loan should be paid off before that particular farm could be dealt with. He could not see where the Treasury was going to lose by advancing the Estates Commissioners sufficient money to pay off the outstanding loans in view of the fact that if they paid off the loans they could charge that sum or even a larger sum to the evicted tenants. This seemed to him to be an unreasonable difficulty which had been thrown in the way in order to prevent the Chief Secretary finally settling the question. It had been stated that the proposal affected Irish finance, but he would remind the House that those who represented Irish taxpayers in the proportion of about four to one as compared with hon. Gentlemen above the gangway, were quite satisfied that the Irish taxpayers were ready to take the risk. If the Chief Secretary desired to settle the question, he did not see why he should not adopt the clause. The right hon. Gentleman had already stated that in dealing with *bona fide* farmers the compulsory powers of the Bill would not be put into operation. He did not see how the right hon. Gentleman could deal effectively with the question unless the present proposal or something similar was adopted. Every bit of untenanted land across the Shannon was required to increase the size of the present holdings. He did not think the British taxpayers would ever have consented to pledge British credit for £100,000,000 if they had not firmly believed that the object was to get rid once for all of the Irish land trouble and the evicted tenants question. He had no doubt that the Unionist Party wished to get back into office as quickly as possible, and naturally they had no overweening desire that the evicted tenants question should be settled, because they believed that they could continue to make political capital out of the unrest of the people of Ireland. There was nothing objectionable in principle to the proposal of the hon. Member for West Waterford. If the Chief Secretary did not accept the new clause, he might find that the evicted tenants question would remain an open sore, and that he would not be able to say at an early date that he had finally and satisfactorily dealt with the Irish land question. He wished to ask hon. Members in all parts of the House whether they desired to have the Irish land question removed from the purview of that House. Did they wish to have it settled, and to let the House get on to other business? If English and Scottish Members did not settle the evicted tenants question now, as they would by this proposal finally and satisfactorily, it would still continue to block the way of social reform in this country.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.) said he did not think the Attorney-General realised the importance of this matter.

MR. CHERRY said he quite realised its importance.

MR. DUFFY thought that if the right hon. and learned Gentleman realised fully the seriousness of the matter, he would accept the new clause. He wished to direct attention to certain cases in the West of Ireland. A short time ago, acting on behalf of tenant occupiers, he brought under the notice of the Estates Commissioners the advisability of taking over from them certain lands. While mediating in the matter he learned that the Estates Commissioners had no power to take over the lands, although the tenant occupiers were willing that they should do so, and that thereby the transfer of the lands to the evicted tenants should be facilitated. The proposal of his hon. friend was that wherever a tenant was willing to part with his interest in a holding the Estates Commissioners should have power to step in and buy the interest in order that the holding might be transferred to an evicted tenant. The Estates Commissioners were at present acquiring land in the West of Ireland. He supposed that was being done in the interest of the evicted tenants. He knew that, speaking so far as the West of Ireland was concerned, the Estates Commissioners in acquiring land had paid more to the landlords for it than they would have had to pay to the tenants who were willing to sell out. Why should the Government interpose difficulties in the way of willing tenants selling to the Estates Commissioners in order that the holdings might be transferred to the evicted tenants? By doing so they were only creating fresh trouble. He appealed to the Chief Secretary to try to clothe the Estates Commissioners with sufficient power to enable them to take over these lands.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said he understood that this was purely a question of finance. Where tenanted land was acquired the purchase price was usually two or three years purchase more than in the case of untenanted land. But if land which was derelict was bought, cattle and other stock had to be supplied, and out-houses had to be built, the result being that, in addition to twenty-three or twenty-four years purchase, there was an outlay of £300 or £400 for equipment. The effect of that was to make the annuity very high. On the other hand, if they bought tenanted land, they got it fully equipped for the incoming tenant, and therefore the annuity would be in many cases less than when untenanted land was bought. There was an opinion in Ireland that evicted tenants should not be sent from one county to another if land could be provided for them in their own county. If the Party to which he belonged wished to keep the agrarian question alive in Ireland they would not vote for this new clause. By voting against it they would vote for what they did not desire, namely, the continuation of the agrarian war. In the interest of all parties in Ireland, and of the Conservative and Liberal Parties in this country, they wanted to have an honest and amicable settlement of the evicted tenants question. As far as the ratepayers were concerned—and he could speak for Conservatives as well as Nationalists in Kerry—the universal wish was to have the question closed, and if there was to be any extra taxation for that purpose they were ready to meet it. He denied, however, that there would be any necessity for additional taxation. He knew several cases where tenants were willing to sell fully-equipped farms at a small price to the Estates Commissioners in order that evicted tenants might be reinstated. There would be no compulsion on the Estates Commissioners to buy in such cases. He would be one of the first to oppose a mandatory clause. This was a purely optional clause giving discretionary power to the Estates Commissioners. The Irish ratepayers were responsible to the British Treasury for every single penny, and he thought no difficulties would arise, financial or otherwise, from the acceptance of the clause. It would be in the interest of all parties concerned to try to keep the evicted tenants in their own districts.

MR. BIRRELL said they were all quite alive to the great difficulty in the way of any Government which sought to acquire the necessary land to reinstate tenants in their old holdings or to find other holdings for them. Hon. Members would see that this measure was necessarily composed under certain final restrictions, and one of the restrictions in the minds of those responsible for framing it was that nothing should be done in any way to interfere with the confidence in, or the system of, the Land Purchase Acts. He agreed that the financial burden cast on the tenant purchaser was sufficiently great already to cause, he would not say alarm, but a reasonable amount of anxiety, and a determination that these purchase annuities should not be made larger than they now were. The Government did not wish to interfere with the operation of the land purchase measures, and therefore they had excluded from the powers of the Estates Commissioners the power of acquiring compulsorily land which had been already made the subject-matter of purchase annuity. It was true that this was a voluntary provision, but the Estates Commissioners had power to take land compulsorily; and were such a power placed within the control of all the parties it might give rise to a feeling of lack of confidence in the measure, leading to pressure being put on persons to part with land for the purpose of reinstating the evicted tenants. It was not desirable, therefore, to extend the area of that confusion. The House also could not leave aside the Treasury in this matter, and say that it was a question wholly for the Irish ratepayers. The Treasury question was one of grave importance. The annuities were already sufficiently high, and he contemplated with alarm the idea of adding another annuity on the land itself. The Government could not accept the new clause.

MR. WALTER LONG said he would not have taken part in the debate had it not been for the suggestion made from below the gangway that the attitude of the Opposition towards the evicted tenants was one of genuine hostility, and that their opposition to the Amendment before the House was a justification of that view. He thought that hon. Gentlemen below the gangway would be forced to admit that their attitude towards the Amendment was the same as that of the Government. If the proposal embraced in the Amendment had been made under normal conditions it would not have been so much objected to. But there was a dominant power already to superimpose annuities on the land which, in one respect, was a tenant's affair rather than a landlord's. The Amendment would raise a financial difficulty, which the Government could not accept. If it were certain that they could confine the operation of the clause to purely voluntary cases, there might be something to be said in favour of including the clause in the Bill; but the Chief Secretary had pointed out that one of the reasons why it could not be accepted was because its acceptance might lead to the use of undue pressure on the occupying tenant. [Cries of "No," from the Irish benches.] He hoped not, but undoubtedly where a tenant was occupying land which was wanted for a particular purpose very great pressure would be put upon him. He was not raising this as a question for which anybody was to be blamed, but there was a reserve of pressure on the man who came in on what was nominally a voluntary bargain, but which was not really a voluntary bargain. The Chief Secretary had commented somewhat sarcastically upon their opposition to the Amendment; but they were learning now from those who were bringing evidence from different localities what were the real difficulties in the settlement of the question. The Chief Secretary had told them on the Motion for the re-committal of the Bill that no further information was required, but the right hon. Gentleman had to admit that it had been pressed upon him from below the gangway that this was not a final settlement of the question. It was well that those home truths should be brought home to the Government. These facts would not interfere with the action of the Opposition, but they would go to show that this was not a fully considered measure. If the Government went to a division in refusing to accept the clause the Opposition would support them.

*Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) said he wished to bring under the notice of the House a case in his own constituency, where the tenant purchased his holding previous to the Act of 1903. After a few years the tenant was unable to pay the purchase annuity, and consequently he was evicted. Previous to his eviction the landlord sold the guarantee deposit to a gentleman in Dublin, and when the tenant was evicted the gentleman from Dublin took up the land and had farmed it ever since. He was informed that since the passing of the Land Purchase Act of 1903, the Dublin gentleman was quite willing to sell the land to the Estates Commissioners in order that they might reinstate the two sons of the former tenant, who had died. But, owing to the Treasury difficulty, the Estates Commissioners could not purchase the farm. If the Chief Secretary accepted this clause it would meet the difficulty, for the farm was practically boycotted, and the two boys would be reinstated in the home from which their father had been evicted.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said that the case quoted by the hon. Gentleman was of great importance. Under the old system evicted farms were taken up as speculative investments when there was some default in the payment of the annuities. But when the speculators found that there was great local feeling they at once offered to give back the farms if the Land Commissioners would give their sanction. The Government ought to find some means of dealing with the case mentioned by the hon. Member for West Limerick. A man had been saddled with an estate in Limerick which he did not want, and he had offered the evicted tenant to give him back the land if the Land Commission would give their sanction to the transfer, but the Land Commission refused to accept back the old evicted tenant on the ground that it had not power to regulate the transaction. In the name of common-sense why should not some modification be made in the section? He was greatly afraid there was some force in what was said by the hon. Member for South Dublin, and that there would be some cases of hardship still in existence after the passing of this Bill. Why not wipe the slate clean when they could by the acceptance of some such Amendment? It was extraordinary that every time a reasonable Amendment was moved the dead hand or live hand of the Treasury was lifted up against it. The House ought to be master of the Treasury. He remembered in 1886 they could not get cupboards because the Treasury would not go to the expense, but after years of agitation each of them got his cupboard and a key. All that was wanted was that someone should kick the rascals who were in office—take those gentlemen and give them a thorough dressing. He had always considered the Irish office was more or less paralysed in its dealings with the Treasury. If they were not going to have Home Rule they ought to go back to the days when there was a Minister of Finance in Ireland. It was said that this farm was boycotted, and if so he must say it was most unjust to the gentleman who never sought the farm but had it thrust on him by the Land Commission. Was it not absurd not to end this running sore and allow the Land Commission to take back the land ?

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes 78 ; Noes 244. (Division List No. 332.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Byles, William Pollard
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Duffy, William J.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mooney, J. J.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehy, David
Snowden, P.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thorne, William
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)

Tellers for the Ayes—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Cave, George
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane Hon. Thos. H. A. E
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W H. (St Pancras, N.
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Duckworth, James
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan

Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkBg'hs)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Nield, Herbert
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C.E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, Henry J. (York W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Younger, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and J. A. Pease.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said he wished to move a clause incorporating certain sections of the Lands Clauses Act of 1845. He believed he would have been more strictly in order if he had moved the incorporation of the clauses of the Railways (Ireland) Act, but as the two Acts were drawn on much the same lines, and as the right hon. Gentleman had thought fit to incorporate one or two clauses of the Land Clauses Act in the Bill, he moved this new clause in order to have a discussion as to the means to be taken under the Bill to assess the amount of money which was to be paid for the land to be taken away from the landlord and new tenant. The sections he wished to incorporate were fifty-three, Sections 15 to 68. They provided that the would-be purchaser who made an offer to the owner of the land should be compelled to purchase just in the same way as the owner could be compelled to sell. That was a fair provision, because if the Land Commission came to close quarters with a landowner and made an offer and put him to trouble, it was only right that he should be in a position to compel them to continue the bargain. They also provided that where the value of the land sought to be taken exceeded £50 the two parties should agree on an arbitrator who should assess the value and the amount to be paid for the land to be taken compulsorily. If the two parties could not agree on an arbitrator, they each appointed an arbitrator, and the arbitrators appointed an umpire, and if that was not done and there was no arbitrator, the case was decided by a jury. They also provided for the payment of the costs of the arbitration. The tribunal it was proposed to set up in this Bill was only worthy of a comic opera. It was a tribunal that did everything itself. It judged the amount of land that it was to take, made an offer, and if the seller did not think that the offer was sufficient he was to have the right to appeal to the same tribunal. There was no justification for such a tribunal. In the Public Sites Act of 1903, and also in the Labourers Act passed last year, it was the arbitrator who fixed the price of the land which was taken, and why should the right hon. Gentleman now change the whole course of legislation by making in this case the people who were taking the land judges in their own cause? There was undoubtedly a great deal of distrust with regard to the Estates Commissioners on the part of Irish landowners owing to the way in which they had been treated in the past. He would, as an illustration, state a case within his own knowledge. A friend of his had an estate in the West of Ireland, and on that estate was a farm the tenants' interest in which had been bought out in order that accommodation land might be given to the other tenants. In February, 1905, his friend approached the Land Commissioners voluntarily, and asked them to buy this farm from him in order that the holdings of his tenants who had agreed to purchase them might be made economic. The Land Commissioners said they would consider the matter, and this gentleman did not get a valuation from them until December, 1906. The farm was 147 acres and the average net rental was £145. The price his friend put upon it was twenty-five years purchase, which, capitalised at 4 per cent. gave him £145 a year. That could not be considered an excessive price having regard to the fact that the average price of such land in 1905–6 was twenty-nine years purchase, and that for the last six years the average price was twenty-seven. The Land Commissioners, after twenty-two months consideration, offered him fourteen years purchase, or £2,100, and said that if he would not accept that they would not declare his estate, which was going to be sold to the tenants, an estate under the Land Act. Under the Act of 1903 the landlord and tenant agreed, voluntarily, the number of years purchase the landlord was to receive for his land, and the arrangements for this estate were made in 1904, and for the Commissioners to come forward with this scandalous threat was a shameful proceeding. Of course his friend was obliged to accept the fourteen years purchase. He said nothing personally against the Estates Commissioners, but in view of the case he had just put to them could the House be surprised that there was considerable distrust, not to say dismay, on the part of the landowners of Ireland when they saw that the final appeal in regard to the price of the land to be taken from them or the new tenant was to be to the Commissioners? There was a precedent for the Government proposal, but they had to go back some thousands of years to the days of Ahab who coveted the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite. When his wife Jezebel asked him—

> "'Why is thy spirit so sad that thou eatest no bread?'"

he replied—

> "'I spoke unto Naboth the Jezreelite and said unto him, give me thy vineyard for money or else if it please thee I will give thee another vineyard for it; and he answered, I will not give thee my vineyard.'"

Jezebel said to him—

> "'Arise and eat bread and let thy heart be merry. I will give thee the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite.'"

They saw the hon. and learned Member for Waterford desiring the vineyards of the new tenants and the right hon. Gentleman, the Chief Secretary, like Jezebel, said—"I will give thee the vineyards of the new tenants. I will write a letter to the Estate Commissioners and say 'get rid of these pestilent fellows who require so many police to look after them.'" The methods of the right hon. Gentleman no doubt were different from the methods of King Ahab, but the end they aimed at was the same.

*MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.), in seconding the Amendment, said the Public Sites Act had been spoken of, under which a Government Department acquired land, but they were not allowed to assess the land at the value they were willing to pay. There were other Acts of more importance in which the House had not thought fit to entrust power to a Government Department compulsorily to acquire land and at the same time fix the price. Under the National Defence Acts tracts of land were acquired, and it might be said that land for the purposes of national defence ought to be acquired at a moderate price. But in that case Parliament had decided that the land was to be acquired under the Lands Clauses Act, and that the full market value was to be paid and independently assessed. This Bill, however, for the first time proposed that the purchaser should fix the price. Many people in Ireland must be reminded, when they considered the Government proposal, of the famous character in the Rebellion, who was not only judge and jury, but who also took advantage of his great stature to hang the prisoners as well. The Estates Commissioners would be put in that position, and, as a lawyer, he confessed he shared the apprehensions of his hon. friend behind him that the Estates Commissioners might not do justice. The Estates Commissioners had used their power of declaring land not to be "an estate" as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the owners to sell at a price which was not adequate. A man might have land in hand, unlet, which was producing a good income, and he was willing to sell it. He agreed with his tenants to sell his tenanted land at a price mutually satisfactory, but when the estate went to the Commissioners they submitted an offer for the lands in hand which the owner considered to be wholly inadequate and which he refused to take. In nearly every instance where the price of the tenanted land had been agreed upon the Estates Commissioners used their power to compel the landlord to sell his untenanted land at a price which he considered inadequate. That had been the system put in operation all over Ireland in connection with the acquisition of the untenanted lands. He would be very glad indeed, even at some sacrifice of principle, to see a settlement of this question, but he did not see the justice of settling the question by employing other people's land, after having acquired it at an inadequate price. If land was to be acquired for the purpose of settling this question, it ought to be bought at a price to be ascertained by the ordinary methods of the law and not by these new powers given to the Commissioners. He did not desire to make any personal imputation upon the Estates Commissioners, but they were certainly interested parties; their whole object was to facilitate the working of the Act, and their fear of the Treasury and of the Irish Office led them to offer prices which were entirely inadequate, and there was no possibility of freedom of bargain. The Commissioners if the Bill passed could say to a man, "We want your land, and offer you so much for it. Whether it is too little or not you have got to take it;" there was to be no appeal and thus there would be absolutely no security against the Commissioners offering even a ridiculous and inadequate sum. He did not say that they would offer a ridiculously inadequate sum, but they did offer, and daily offered, as everyone knew, inadequate prices; and if they resorted to the indirect process of declaring land to be or not to be an estate, in order to compel landlords to take prices they did not like, what would they do when they had power, not by this indirect method, of bringing pressure to bear, but to say, "You are going to get so much and no more"? There was no appeal under the Act, and the proposed purchasers could take the land by compulsion and themselves name the price they were prepared to give. So far as he was personally concerned if the Bill embodied the principles of his hon. friend's Amendment, his objections to the measure would be practically at an end. Everyone was anxious to see the question settled, but he thought it ought to be settled with justice, and, if the Amendment was not adopted, there would be left behind in the minds of the owners of land a rankling sense of grievance that they had been compulsorily deprived of their lands at an inadequate price.

New clause—

"The provisions of the Lands Clauses Act, 1845, relating to the purchase and taking of lands otherwise than by agreement, are incorporated in this Act."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. CHERRY said he was really surprised that this clause should be moved, and he was still more surprised that such an eminent lawyer as his hon. friend who had just spoken should have appeared in support of it. He had only to point out to the House the effect of the adoption of the clause to show its absurdity. If it was passed it would entirely contradict the Bill as it had passed through Committee. In this Bill they had a complete scheme for the acquisition of land, a scheme which followed the same lines as the House adopted last year in the Labourers Act. In Clause 2 they provided what the Commissioners were to do, and what were the kind of steps that were always necessary in order to obtain land compulsorily. If they incorporated the Lands Clauses Act of 1845—only one Act was mentioned, although there were a whole series of Lands Clauses Acts which were different in Ireland from those in England—whenever anyone came to interpret the Act, they would be met with the question whether the procedure was to be under Clause 2 of this Bill or under the Lands Clauses Act. It would introduce confusion and uncertainty, and no Judge or lawyer would be able to interpret the Bill when it became law. Moreover, the hon. Member who moved the Amendment could not be aware that the ultimate tribunal under the Lands Clauses Act for ascertaining the value of land taken was the jury of the county in which the land was situated. The effect would be that a jury of Roscommon or Leitrim would fix the value of land that was being purchased for the reinstatement of evicted tenants. He knew some hon. Members from Ireland who would be rather in favour of adopting a clause of that kind. But the Government were bound to protect the owners. They thought that the system proposed was a fair system, and that the Estates Commissioners were not gentlemen whose only object was to try and cheat the landlords out of their property; they were gentlemen who would perform their public duties to the best of their ability. The procedure under the Bill would be simple, and he could not assent to a clause which would throw the whole thing into confusion, and which if put in force would lead to injustice to the very persons the hon. Member wished to protect.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said the right hon. and learned Member had expressed his amazement at the clause proposed, but he thought the feeling of those who had listened to the debate—especially after the attempt of the right hon. and learned Member to evade the point—must be one of amazement that the Government should harden its heart to resist this clause. The Chief Secretary laughed, but he would not laugh so much if he knew the state of affairs in Galway. To many persons the case of many tenants in Galway was no laughing matter.

Mr. BIRRELL: I was not laughing at the evicted tenants.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT asked what was the state of things now? The absolute power of evicting these tenants and of fixing the amount of compensation which they were to receive was to be in the hands of the Estates Commissioners. It must be obvious to anyone who knew the circumstances in Ireland or in any other country that if power was given to three men to evict tenants who had occupied their holdings for over twenty-five years and fixed the compensation it would be very unjust. He would remind the House that the hon. Member for South Tyrone once stated that he would never vote for a proposal which said to a man who had lived on a farm for twelve or fourteen years, "You must give up your holding to the man who previously had it." A feeling of friction must be caused against the Commissioners when they came to decide who should be evicted; the feelings of the tenants who were evicted towards the three men who had evicted them must be anything but kindly. Surely the Commissioners were not fair arbiters as to the amount of compensation to be paid to the tenants who would be turned out. Although the Chief Secretary had made so merry over the unfortunate condition of these men——

MR. BIRRELL: When did I make merry over them?

MR. T. L. CORBETT said the right hon. Gentleman had treated the debate with the greatest levity and had done so again and again whenever they tried to meet the case of the unfortunate men who had been upon their holdings for a quarter of a century and whose families had been born and bred there, and who, under this Bill, would be turned out of their holdings.

MR. BIRRELL: That will not be the effect of this Bill.

MR. T. L. CORBETT thought the fact he had stated was a conclusive argument for the re-committal of the Bill. Anybody who knew anything about Ireland knew that what he had described was the actual state of things. The right hon. Gentleman said that the turning out of the men who had been on these holdings for forty years would not be the effect of this measure. He was sorry to say that he did not think the Chief Secretary knew what the actual effect of his Bill would be.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) said he had failed to find any relevancy whatever in the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down to the Amendment proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Blackpool. He hoped the Government would not be induced to depart from their decision to oppose this Amendment. The value of this Bill was that it should become operative expeditiously, and this Amendment would add fifty-two cumbersome clauses. This was a small and simple Act dealing with a subject which did not affect a very wide area. It contained only fifteen clauses, and to suggest that fifty-two new clauses of a cumbersome character should be added to it was one of the most preposterous propositions he had ever heard made. This Bill was intended to restore a certain class of tenants to their former holdings. The evicted tenants were standing at the present time outside the gate of the peasants' paradise in Ireland, which was the ownership and possession of land. The springs of the gate were already moving to admit them, and the proposals contained in this Bill had set those springs going. The Amendment under consideration would introduce a method of procedure calculated to greatly delay that operation. It proposed arbitration; where arbitration failed, umpires were suggested; and where umpires failed, special juries would be called in. All this was cumbersome from beginning to end, and instead of oiling the springs of the Bill the Amendment would hamper, frustrate, and probably annul it altogether. The case was very urgent, and that was the main reason why the House should not accept the Amendment. The proposal had no doubt been made in good faith, but if the hon. Gentleman would only look into the clauses he proposed to embody he would see that instead of expediting its the operation of the Bill, it would hamper it considerably, and that was a good reason why the House should reject it.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said the Bill dealt with matters of very great importance, and he felt very strongly in regard to the position of the unfortunate new tenants. Upon several occasions he had been obliged to laugh at some of the explanations which had been given by the Attorney-General. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to the procedure which the Bill set up for ascertaining the price to be paid for these lands as a simple procedure. That procedure certainly was the greatest example of simplicity which the House had ever had to consider. Let the House compare for a moment the procedure suggested by the Bill with that contained in any other Act proposed under similar conditions. In all other similar measures there was some form of arbitration, and the person whose property was taken compulsorily had some say in the appointment of the persons who were to fix the price of the land. Under this Bill the owner had absolutely nothing to say in the matter, and the duty of fixing the price of the land was placed on persons in whom the owners had very little confidence. But even if they had all the confidence in the world, surely when their property was taken from them it was only right that they should have some say in the choice of an arbitrator or judge? This simple procedure, they had been told, was exactly the same as that under the Labourers Act. He wished to point out that under this Bill an inspector was sent down who practically said, "I want this piece of land and I am going to give you so much for it." It might be 50 per cent. under its proper value or it might be over its proper value, but, at any rate, here was a person in the appointment of whom the landlord had no say whatever, who had the power to choose what land he required and also to fix the price to be paid for it That was bad enough, and if the matter stopped there, and if some such provision as was provided for in the Amendment were inserted, things would not be quite so bad; but there was to be no appeal from that extraordinary procedure, and it would be placed in one person's hands to say what land was to be taken and how much was to be paid for it. That might be simple from the point of view of the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, but it was very unjust, and in his opinion, if the House was allowed to judge for itself instead of accepting the view of the Attorney-General, it would never consent to put such extraordinary powers into the hands of a single individual. The Attorney-General had told them that the procedure was the same under the Labourers Act.

MR. CHERRY said that that was not what he said. His statement was that they found a precedent in the Labourers Act.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said that under the Labourers Act the rural district council held the position which under this Act was given to the Estates Commissioners. They were empowered to go to a landowner and say "We desire to have this piece of land for labourers cottages." They would then draw up a scheme, but they had to bring in an outside authority in the shape of an inspector to fix the price. There was a fundamental difference between the two Acts at the very outset. In the case of the Labourers Act the persons who chose the ground were not the same persons who fixed the price. The machinery of the Labourers Act enabled a scheme to be thrown out if it was found on inquiry that the provisions were being used for the purpose of persecuting a farmer or landlord, but there was absolutely nothing of the sort in this Bill, and to say that it in any way resembled the Labourers Act was to mislead the House, though not intentionally. It was absolutely futile to say that because this measure would be administered by public servants that they had no interest in giving a smaller price for the land than its value. Anyone who was provided with public money for the purpose of buying anything had as a matter of duty to make as good a bargain as he could, and it was not fair that the Estate Commissioners who were in the position of buyers should also have the fixing of the price. It certainly was unfair to the landlords. The Amendment had been objected to it by the Nationalist Members because it would incorporate in the Bill the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act. That Act had been in operation for over fifty years. Its peculiarities and shortcomings were well-known to lawyers, and he did not think there would be any particular difficulty caused by its application in this case. He did not say that the tribunal provided by the Lands Clauses Act was the best in the world, but it was far better than the proposal in the Bill. The incorporation of the Lands Clauses Act would remove a great blot on the Bill, namely, the absolute unfairness and injustice to those whose land was to be compulsorily acquired. The Chief Secretary had said that he did not know this Bill would have the effect of putting out tenants who had been in possession of their farms for twenty-five years. The right hon. Gentleman must be more simple-minded than he thought if after listening to the Amendments proposed by Nationalist Members, designed to give still greater powers to the Commissioners than the Bill proposed, he was still of opinion that the measure would not operate in the direction of turning out new tenants from their holdings. It was absolutely futile for the Chief Secretary to pretend that the agitation when the Bill was passed would not be directed to clearing out the present holders and reinstating persons who had been evicted. Hon. Members below the gangway had admitted that they would use their powers of persuasion towards having the evicted tenants reinstated in the identical holdings from which they had been evicted. He was not very much enamoured of the particular form of the Amendment. It was difficult to suggest an efficient tribunal which would be comparatively cheap and free from cumbersomeness, but that such a tribunal could be suggested, and ought to be set up, he had equally no doubt.

MR. BIRRELL said the Attorney-General had already pointed out that hopeless confusion would follow from the adoption of the Amendment which would mean the incorporation of fifty-two clauses of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act. Were they to believe that the mover of the Amendment wished that?

MR. ASHLEY said he did not pretend that this would be the most perfect form, but under the Resolution which closured the Bill it was quite impossible to have any discussion whatever on this very important point.

MR. BIRRELL said that was a matter as to the disposition of time. In his opinion hon. Members opposite were to blame if the Bill was not discussed. Any Opposition could, if it chose, prevent the later clauses of a Bill from being discussed by discussing at enormous length the preceding clauses. He maintained that ample time was provided for the discussion of Clause 2. Did the hon. Gentleman suggest that the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act should be substituted for Clause 2? If so, it might have been supposed that he would have had the foresight to put on the Paper an Amendment to strike out Clause 2. He did not know whether the hon. Member was really serious in his proposal. He could not suppose the hon. Member was anxious to refer these matters from the Estates Commissioners to a jury. As to the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, he had benefited as a lawyer far too much from it ever to speak disrespectfully of it. He remembered attending a dinner at the Surveyors' Institute where there was only one toast, and it was drunk with almost royal honours, namely, "The Lands Clauses Act and no amendment." He did not exaggerate when he said that it had put millions of money into the pockets of lawyers, surveyors, and other ministering angels of justice, and if they applied its provisions to the acquisition of land under this measure they would defeat the purpose in view and load the matter with costly proceedings. If 80,000 acres were to be acquired for the purpose of reinstating the evicted tenants, either in their old holdings or in new holdings, some cheap and speedy tribunal must be set up, otherwise the thing could not be done. An hon. Member had stated that he would have preferred the machinery of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act to any other machinery. That would have involved the nomination of a single arbitrator. He could not believe the proposal of a single arbitrator by the Irish Government for the purpose of determining the value of land would have received any support from hon. Gentlemen opposite. He did not think anything could be made of the point that a single arbitrator would be a better tribunal than the three Estates Commissioners. He must not say that this point had been discussed *ad nauseam*, but if there was one point which had been argued over and over again it was the question whether the machinery of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act was preferable to that proposed by the Bill. He still maintained that the mere fact that the Estates Commissioners were the persons who had set this machinery agoing in any way exposed them to the suggestion that they had a personal interest in the fixing of the value of the land. He could not understand how it possibly could be said that these gentlemen, who had no personal interest to serve, who were not going to benefit by 1s. from the measure, who were not to be paid in proportion, but in inverse proportion to the amount of the purchase money which fell to the landlord, were to gain any advantage whatever from the Bill. They had got no interest in keeping down the value of land in Ireland. And to impute to them motives which even a rural district council had in keeping down the rates was unworthy. Everybody would admit that to substitute the machinery of the Lands Clauses Act would be to admit that they did not attach importance to their own Bill.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said that the right hon. Gentleman had declared that the Commissioners would not have the slightest interest in the administration of the Act; but they had announced that they would like to increase the number of holdings in Ireland by 183,000. That might be a very laudable object, but if the Commissioners gave a less price for the land they would get more land for the new holdings. The right hon. Gentleman objected to the Amendment because it would take time. He agreed that it would take time, but better that than that injustice should be done. There was an underlying necessity in all tribunals that justice should be done. They, on the opposition side of the House, thought that they were not getting justice. This new tribunal would exercise its great powers unchecked, absolutely without control, and confiscation would be the result. The Commissioners could take what land they liked, put their own price upon it; they would be responsible to no one, and there would be no appeal. There was no wonder that those who had a liking for fair play and justice should support the Amendment. He preferred delay to expeditious injustice.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) asked whether it was correct to say that grazing lands which at present were worth £2 an acre could be bought by the Estates Commissioners compulsorily at £1 an acre? If so, would not that keep down the price of land all over Ireland? The hon. Member for North Kildare had stated that in his opinion the Amendment would be unworkable because it would cause delay in the administration of the Act and that the necessity of the case was expedition. He believed in expedition in all the affairs of life, but not at the expense of justice. It had been stated that the Amendment would incorporate into this Bill fifty-two clauses from the Lands Clauses Act. No doubt that was a large number, but under those fifty-two clauses justice would be obtained. Those clauses had been in existence for sixty years, and under them justice had always been administered. [Cries of "No" from the MINISTERIAL and IRISH benches.] At any rate a proper price had been given to people whose property had been taken from them by compulsion. Now came the right hon. Gentleman and said that the Commissioners when they saw a piece of property which they liked could take it compulsorily and fix the price, and there was no rule laid down in the Bill to indicate what price they should pay, and there was no appeal from their decision. It was absurd to say, therefore, that a fair and proper price would be given under the provisions of the Bill. Instead of settling the land question—which they all wished to do—[Cries of "Oh" from the IRISH benches]—it would unsettle it. Under these circumstances he would support the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 69: Noes, 263. (Division List No. 333.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHnA.J.(City Lond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie,H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
CraigCharles Curtis(Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner,Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F (BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill,Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hn.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R
Long,Rt.HnWalter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ratherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Wards, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ashley and Sir Frederick Banbury.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJH (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex,Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt.HnSirJT (Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.HnRichard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J (S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn. Herbert Jn.
Glover, Thomas
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHnSir W.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Pastick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirDBrynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jordon, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Craie, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinbugh,Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)

Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards,TF (Wolverhampton)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirGScott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,RtHnE. (Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson,Henry J. (York,W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. ASHLEY moved a new clause which provided that: "Where any land is compulsorily purchased or taken under this Act all sporting rights hitherto enjoyed by the vendor shall, if he so desires, remain vested in him notwithstanding such purchase." He maintained that this clause was not out of harmony with the traditions of the Act of 1903, and the House ought to continue the spirit of that Act. When pieces of a landlord's property were to be dealt with compulsorily the general amenities as well as the sporting rights of the property would be injured, and it was a distinct asset to the old landlord that he should be left in possession of his demesne and the amenities attached to his residence. The Irish landlords were debarred in consequence of their religion and politics from taking any political or other share in the local life of the community, and were, therefore, thrown back on the enjoyment of the amenities of their residences. The policy of the Government should be to encourage the spending of money in Ireland in the same way as was now done in the cause of sport in Scotland.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) seconded the Motion.

New clause—

"Where any land is compulsorily purchased or taken under this Act all sporting rights hitherto enjoyed by the vendor shall, if he so desires, remain vested in him notwithstanding such purchase."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

MR. GWYNN said he opposed this clause because he was one of the people who were extremely anxious that there should continue to be game in Ireland. The hon. Member did not know very much about Ireland or understand the people very well. He held that the only way to make Ireland a comfortable country for shooting or fishing was to vest the game in the occupiers of the holdings. The only places where shooting and fishing were satisfactory at the present moment were those places where the sporting rights were vested in the occupiers. The effect of this clause would prohibit anything of the sort. He protested against the clause and prophesied that if an evicted tenant was planted on a holding over which the landlord had shooting and fishing rights he would undertake that there would be nothing either to shoot or fish.

MR. CHERRY said the Government could not accept the proposal. He did not think anything would be more likely to cause friction and trouble between landlord and evicted tenant who was restored compulsorily to the land than the continuance of the sporting rights in the hands of the landlord. The exercise of the landlord's right to enter upon the land at any time give rise to very great trouble between the parties and disputes and bloodshed might arise. It was very desirable now that the whole system of land purchase was being carried out that the landlords should waive all rights whatsoever. The reason that the Bill was brought in was to do away with quarrelling and friction.

MR. WALTER LONG thought there was a good deal in the argument that if the sporting rights were properly exercised they would form a valuable source of revenue to the country. If they were allowed to be distributed over a large number of people owning each a small amount of land there would be no sporting rights at all. He thought it would be a bad thing if a single plot of land were taken in the middle of an estate for the purposes of reinstatement and that the tenant should have the sporting rights. That would spoil the whole of the shooting on the estate.

MR. CHERRY stated that in the Act of 1903 there was a provision which left it open to the Estates Commissioners to allow the vendor in any particular case to retain by agreement the sporting rights.

MR. WALTER LONG agreed that that met that part of the case. It was important that a landlord should be enabled to retain the sporting rights when only a portion of his estate was taken. It was in the best interests of Ireland that the sporting possibilities of the country should be developed, for they would undoubtedly be a very valuable source of income to the country

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that after what the right hon. Gentleman had stated he supposed the Amendment would be withdrawn. He quite agreed with the right hon. Member for South Dublin as to the specific value of the preservation of game. But the preservation of game depended absolutely on the sympathy of the people, and any attempt to preserve game without that sympathy must be an utter failure. He controverted the statement that game could not be preserved if the preservation was distributed over a large number of people. He knew a mountain in Wicklow that was sold some time ago. Before it was sold the sporting rights were leased every year and gamekeepers were employed and so forth. But for the last few years the game had been diminishing in quantity. The mountain had now been bought by some fifteen families who lived in the valleys who purchased the grazing rights. They formed themselves into a committee for the preservation of the game and leased the shooting every year, and it was interesting to know that the rental for the shooting on that mountain was more than enough to cover the annuity which these families had to pay to the Commissioners. The moment this arrangement was made these men themselves became the gamekeepers, and it was only in that way in his opinion that the game could be made a valuable asset to Ireland. If that example could not be followed they must undoubtedly despair of preserving the game, but if they enlisted the sympathy of the people themselves in the work, he believed that game in Ireland would soon become a valuable asset to the country.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said, as the discussion had assumed such a friendly character, he ventured to suggest that if the Government could not accept the words proposed they might do something else in the way of concession. He quite agreed that it was quite impossible for game to be preserved unless there was co-operation between landlord and tenant. He thought the rights should be vested in the owners of the soil. If they were vested in the tenants game would very soon disappear. To his mind the experience of which the hon. and learned Gentleman had spoken was a unique one, and they must be far from expecting it all over Ireland. The preservation of game ought certainly to be a bond of union between landlord and tenant, and he believed that if words were put in the Bill by which the rights were left with the landlords, very good results would follow. As they were endeavouring to conciliate all sides by means of this Bill, he believed that it would only be justice that the rights in question should be left with the landlords. They were rights which they certainly exercised under the Act of 1903, and which he hoped would be continued to them.

New Clause and Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND moved a clause which provided for non-liability of tenants for debts contracted prior to purchase. It would be remembered, he said, that the other night a subsection was put into Clause 8 protecting the restored tenant's holding in respect of debts incurred previous to the reinstatement. That had been done on the ground that the money was given by the State for the purpose of reinstatement, and that it would be absurd if the next day a private creditor could walk in and sell the tenant up. The Amendment which stood in his name was really part of the Amendment which stood in the name of his hon. friend the Member for Dublin, who had asked him to move this portion of it. He admitted that as it stood on the Paper it was too wide, and all he asked was that there should be some protection of the property given to these restored tenants. It would be absurd that, after the Government had given the tenant a farm and stocked it, the next day a creditor might walk in and seize the property provided with the money of the State. If the Government could suggest words which would protect these chattels he would not move this Amendment, which he thought too wide, and wider than he intended. He would, however, formally move the clause in order to see what the Government would do.

Mr. O'SHEE seconded the Motion.

New clause—

"No evicted tenant who has purchased a holding under the Act of 1903, or who shall purchase a holding under the said Act or under this Act, shall be liable to be adjudicated a bankrupt, or to have any of his property taken in execution, or otherwise made liable to satisfy any debt contracted or incurred by such evicted tenant prior to the date of the order vesting such holding in him."—(*Mr. John Redmond.*)

Brought up and read a first time.

Viscount Castlereagh.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. BIRRELL said the Bill as already drawn up contained, as the hon. and learned Member had just said, a subsection in Clause 8, protecting the holding in respect of debts contracted by the tenant before his reinstatement, and he agreed that the protection given to the holding itself should extend to stock and equipment, where such was provided by the State. Although it was quite understood the Commission would carefully consider the financial position and would not reinstate a notoriously impecunious tenant or one who was heavily in debt, still there might be a debt hanging over the tenant, and on the morrow of his reinstatement his means of livelihood might be swept away by the creditors. He apprehended that it was not the intention of the House to give a person the means of paying his debts. The object in making a grant was to enable the tenant to live and thrive, and therefore some words should be inserted to protect the stock and equipment as the holding was protected under Clause 8. Caution in the selection of words was necessary, and perhaps there should be a time limit, but the intention was that the Treasury grant should not be forthwith appropriated for the satisfaction of an outstanding debt. While providing for protection for the grant from the State, at the same time it was necessary to avoid the setting up of a class of tenants who would not be liable for the settlement of their debts. He could not at the moment propose words in substitution of those in the Amendment which were too wide, but he would undertake that the proposal should be made in another place.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I can withdraw if the right hon. Gentleman moves.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am afraid I cannot do that without notice. All I can do is to undertake that words shall be moved in another place.

Mr. WALTER LONG said it was comforting to hear these allusions to another place where work could be done that could not be done in that House;

and it was satisfactory, in spite of what was said by hon. Gentlemen opposite, that there was still some practical usefulness in a Second Chamber.

Mr. BIRRELL was understood to say that that had never been denied.

Mr. WALTER LONG said he had merely offered the observation in passing. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it was not the intention of the House that there should be taken from a man goods which had been made his as the result of the action of Parliament. He took it that the Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to bring up in another place would not protect any property which was the tenant's own, and which had not been acquired by him under the Bill. Of course, it was obvious that it would be ridiculous that somebody else should get the benefit of what the State had given the tenant, but he hoped that the words drawn up for the purpose of meeting that case would make it perfectly clear that a man would have no advantage from them save in respect of that which he held by the kindness of the State.

Mr. BIRRELL: Certainly.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said that if the right hon. Gentleman could not accept the words now, how did he know what another place would do? The right hon. Gentleman had not command of big battalions in the other House, and the Bill might come back without anything having been put in.

Mr. BIRRELL said he had been told that he could not move a new clause without notice.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said it would be possible to move an Amendment to the proposed new clause by inserting the words: "No chattel appertaining to the holding and acquired within the meaning of Section 8 or Section 2 of this Act shall be liable to be taken in satisfaction of any debt prior to," etc. He thought those words would meet the case; at all events it would give them something on which they could draft their Amendments in the House of Lords.

Mr. BIRRELL said that what he could do was to leave out all the words after the word "No," and insert these words: "Farm stock or other chattels provided for the evicted tenant by means of a grant or loan from the Estates Commissioners, under the Act of 1903, shall be liable to be taken in execution or otherwise made liable to satisfy any debt prior to the date of the Order vesting the holding in him."

Mr. T. M. HEALY: That would be right.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT, on a point of order, asked what they were discussing. He understood they were considering a particular Amendment, and hon. Members had been simply bandying words across the floor of the House.

Viscount CASTLEREAGH said the hon. and learned Member for Waterford seemed somewhat apprehensive on this subject, and he shared that apprehension. They had ample cause to be apprehensive with regard to the Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to move in place of the proposition before the House. A proposal of this kind must inevitably destroy the credit of the evicted tenants, because they would be boycotted. Any words of the kind suggested would be liable to the greatest possible abuse, and it was obviously undesirable that goods should be taken at a moment's notice. It should be remembered that in reinstating evicted tenants consideration would be paid to finding out whether they were desirable tenants. It could not be held that a man who had a great many debts in the neighbourhood was a desirable tenant.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time.

Mr. CHERRY moved to amend the clause so that it would read: "No farm stock, or other chattels, provided for the evicted tenant by means of a grant or loan from the Estates Commissioners under the Act of 1903, or under this Act, shall be made available in any bankruptcy, or by any process or proceeding at law, to pay, satisfy, or discharge, in whole or in part, any debt contracted or incurred by such evicted tenant prior to the date of the Order vesting such holding in him."

Mr. WALTER LONG said that more than once the Government had declined to amend the Act of 1903. They had held that this Bill was based upon that Act, and they had declined to accept Amendments contrary to the spirit of the main Act. Under the Amendment now suggested by the Attorney-General they might be doing something in regard to which many of them had very little knowledge, because they were now making this proposition applicable to the evicted tenants under the main Act. He would like to know whether the Government were accepting responsibility now for doing what they had frequently refused to do before, namely, making a serious Amendment of the Act of 1903 under cover of this Bill.

Mr. BIRRELL replied that when the Government had said they had no intention of interfering with the Land Act of 1903 they meant the operations of land purchase under that Act. This was a small matter relating simply to the position of evicted tenants who had obtained an equipment grant. It was not desirable to make distinctions between tenants in this matter.

Viscount CASTLEREAGH asked if the right hon. Gentleman would give the House some assurance that his representative in another place would be authorised to go very carefully into this matter.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG moved a clause limiting the number of evicted tenants to be reinstated or supplied with new holdings under the Bill to 2,000. He said his object was to provide some finality to the Bill. It was generally supposed that not more than 500 or 600 tenants would have to be dealt with under the Act of 1903, but from the Report of the Commissioners they found that 1,000 evicted tenants had been dealt with already, and that it was proposed to deal with 2,000 more. While he and his friends adhered to what they said in 1903—namely, that all *bona fide* evicted tenants should be reinstated, such a large number above the number supposed to exist in 1903 had been produced that they thought some definite limitation should be inserted in the Bill beyond which the Estates Commissioners should not be allowed to go. The object he had in view might be met either by limiting the number of persons to be reinstated or the amount of land to be provided; but he held that some limitation should be placed on the powers of the Commissioners in this respect.

Mr. BARRIE seconded the Motion. He appealed to the Government, in the interests of the Estates Commissioners and of those tenants who would be dispossessed of their holdings to make room for the evicted tenants, to accept the clause. The duties of the Commissioners under the Bill were not properly appreciated in the House, affecting as they did their primary duties which they had to discharge under the Land Act. The agitation which had led to the introduction of this Bill had met with marked success. As the representative of another class of tenants in Ireland he felt that he was fairly entitled to ask that the Government should state the total number of evicted tenants to whom this revolutionary piece of legislation was to apply. He deplored that these new duties should be laid upon the Estates Commissioners, because it would lead to the hanging up of the voluntary provisions of the Land Act. He understood that the hon. Member for South Tyrone had received remonstrances from the north of Ireland as to the delay that was taking place in the operation of the purchase clauses of the Land Act.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I have had remonstrances as to the price.

Mr. BARRIE said he believed that remonstrances had appeared in the public Press that the hon. Gentleman had not introduced his own Bill. He was sure that many of the hon. Member's friends in the north of Ireland would be interested to hear from him what his intentions were in regard to that matter. An earnest desire existed in many parts of Ireland that they should finally see the end of this class of pernicious legislation. He thought he would not be using too strong language when he said that it was legislation which put a premium on dishonesty.

MR. FLAVIN asked if the hon. Gentleman would say where the dishonesty came in.

MR. BARRIE said he would remind the hon. Member that the official body which he represented were responsible for the evicted tenants. They heard a great deal in these latter days of patriotism. He always understood that true patriotism was an unselfish thing; but his hon. friends below the gangway did not see it in that way.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) asked the Deputy-Speaker if the hon. Member was in order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said that the hon. Member was not dealing with the new clause.

MR. BARRIE said that, in deference to the ruling of the Deputy-Speaker, he would not pursue that subject. But he would say that there was a tendency for the number of evicted tenants who sought to be re-instated still to increase. He maintained that in the interest of the British taxpayer, if not in that of the Irish taxpayer, some provision should be inserted in the Bill limiting the number. He objected to the taking away of the Estates Commissioners from their duties connected with the working of the Land Purchase Act of 1903.

New clause—

"The number of evicted tenants to be re-instated or supplied with new holdings under this Act is hereby limited to two thousand."—(*Mr. Charles Craig.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CHERRY said he had heard that speech over and over again. It and the previous speech had consisted of nothing but vain repetition, and he could only repeat the answer which had been given over and over again. The Estates Commissioners had reported that 1,609 tenants appeared to them to be such as deserved to be restored. They estimated that of the remaining applications about 400 would similarly be considered to be suitable to be restored, say, in all, 2,009, although they might be willing to cut off the nine.

MR. BARRIE said that as far as he was concerned he would be quite willing to cut another 200.

MR. CHERRY said he could not understand why hon. Members would not allow some sense to the Estates Commissioners. They had gone through all this matter, and they had practically made up their minds. They, however, did not want to be tied down to a particular figure, but to be allowed a little freedom.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he could share the complaint of the Attorney-General against the manner in which the Amendment had been moved. But he thought the hon. Gentlemen above the gangway had subserved a useful function by moving those foolish Amendments which enabled the House to take the measure of the opponents of Home Rule. They were asked, for the first time, to place a numerical limitation on an act of justice. Supposing there were 2,001 persons who sought reinstatement, when they came to 2,000 they were to be told that no more justice was to be given! Suppose a limitation of the kind was proposed to the right to recover small debts, or in actions for breach of promise! The thing was absurd. Really hon. Gentlemen had done a useful service by repeating themselves over and over again, but he wished to give them the benefit of the admission that they were doing their best.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH asked the Attorney-General if he could state definitely whether there would or would not be more than 2,000 applications.

MR. CHERRY said he could not say.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH said that there were a great many men in Ireland who had gone so far as to curse the hon. Members for Waterford and East Mayo when they lost their holdings under the Plan of Campaign. As the right hon. and learned Gentleman could not give the House the information he asked for, he begged to move the adjournment of the House in order that the Chief Secretary might return to his place and supply them with the information.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : A Motion for the adjournment of the House from a private Member is not possible under the Resolution governing our procedure on this Bill.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said that many of those who did not take part in these debates felt very strongly in regard to this Bill. He supported the clause because he thought that if a smaller sum were stated they were likely to do less injustice. He had received a letter from a man in Ireland in regard to this Bill. That man owned property in Ireland, and twenty years ago he turned out several of his tenants who had paid no rent for three or four years. During those twenty years he had built up his property, and had put it in order; in fact he had made it his life's work. And now he found himself obliged to leave his farm and hand it over to some other man.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL asked why the hon. Gentleman assumed that a man in that position was going to be compelled to leave his farm. Why was it that hon. Gentlemen opposite denied to the Estates Commissioners, who were appointed by their own Government, all sense of fair play, all sense of public decency? He had never heard men attacked, even in the most troubled times of Irish history, as these three officials had been attacked. He had heard a great many hard things said about Irish magistrates and others, but he had never heard such attacks made on these men, who were incapable of defending themselves there, ever since this Bill had been brought before the House. All he could say was that it was a gross outrage that it should be so.

MR. PIKE PEASE said that by the courtesy of the House he wished to be allowed to read the letter. [Loud cries of "No" from the IRISH Benches.]

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said that the hon. Member could not read the letter without the general assent of the House.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 43 ; Noes, 234. (Division List No. 334.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Hn. Hichael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, G'v'n)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy, Laurenc (Kent, Ashf'd)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'ds)
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Pee
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. G. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. Hugh Barrie.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ambrose, Robert
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)

Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,F.J.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt.Hn.Sir J.T. (Ches.)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Patrick A.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E.(Edinburgh,Central
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T.F. (Wovlerh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt.Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset.E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, RtHn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley,John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters

Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG moved to omit Clause 1 (power to acquire land compulsorily). He apologised for inflicting upon the House what was practically a Second Reading speech, but said the clause was of the utmost importance as it contained the main principle of the Bill. It contained the principle of compulsion, and allowed the Estates Commissioners to acquire tenanted land. He desired to register again the determination of his colleagues and himself that, so far as it lay in their power, they would not allow such a clause to pass. They considered that compulsion was unnecessary to carry out the intention of the Act of 1903 so far as it applied to evicted tenants. They considered it unnecessary because they believed that under the voluntary powers of the Act of 1903 the Estates Commissioners had carried out far more in the way of reinstatement of evicted tenants than was ever expected, or hoped by the supporters of the Act. During the discussion it was repeatedly said by Nationalists that if 600 or 700 evicted tenants were reinstated the evicted tenants' question would be settled once and for all. Over 1,000 tenants had been reinstated. He had understood at the passing of the Act of 1903 that only tenants who had been evicted in the course of the Plan of Campaign were to be reinstated, and it was a revelation to him to know that all evicted tenants, no matter what was the cause of their eviction, were to be reinstated. There were a hundred and one reasons which caused people in all countries to be evicted—bad farming, failure to pay rent, thriftlessness, and many other causes led to it; but of the seventeen Plan of Campaign estates, fifteen had been settled, so that it might be said that fifteen-seventeenths, or at any rate a large proportion of the *bona fide* political evicted tenants, had been restored to their farms. Besides the Plan of Campaign estates, there were a great number of other tenants throughout Ireland who had been evicted. The present Bill asked the House to grant the most extraordinary powers of compulsory acquisition of land which had been granted to any body of men. They could reinstate, not only the so-called "wounded soldiers of the land war," but the men who lost their farms for other than political reasons. If it were admitted that the vast majority of the political evicted tenants had been reinstated, and if it were admitted that those were the persons whom they were primarily legislating for in 1903, then there was no necessity in the wide world to come to the House and ask for compulsory powers to reinstate those other evicted tenants. The tenants who lost their farms for non-political causes had less claim on the indulgence of the House than the political evicted tenants. It was quite unnecessary to ask for compulsory powers to acquire land to reinstate these tenants, because it had been shown that in the three years that had elapsed since the passing of the Act of 1903, 1,000 tenants had already been reinstated, and if the same rate of progress continued the whole of the evicted tenants, if they did not exceed 2,000, would be reinstated in from four to six years. With regard to acquiring tenanted land, both the hon. Member for Waterford and the hon. Member for East Mayo had categorically and specifically stated that they did not ask that any new tenant should be put out of his holding to make room for the evicted tenant, and he regarded it as a breach of faith on the part of those two hon. Gentlemen and their Party as a whole to ask now that these unfortunate men should leave their farms which had been their homes for so many years in order to put back men who would be greater strangers to the holdings than the present tenants. Having regard to the way in which the debate had developed, his hon. friends and himself thought the question of the tenanted land was the most important part of the Bill. If the Bill was passed in its present form the Chief Secretary told them that the case of a new tenant being put out of his holding would be very rare and that that power would be exercised by the Estates Commissioners only on the rarest occasions. If they had had some real assurance that that would be so—if they had had any limitations in the Bill—they might have taken another view of the matter. But there were no limitations which differentiated the new tenant who was a *bona fide* farmer from the man who waa a mere caretaker. He had no great objection to the latter class being compensated and turned out of their holding to make room for the original tenant, but that class did not constitute the majority of new tenants. His information was that the majority of new tenants were *bona fide* farmers, and it was not right for the House of Commons to hand over these men to the animosity and hostility of the Estates Commissioners, who would have the whole command of this Act put into their hands and who would be subjected to the enormous power wielded by the United Irish League to get these unfortunate men out of their farms. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford made no secret of the fact that since the passing of the Act of 1903 he had done all in his power to dispossess the new tenants and get the evicted tenants put into their places, and it was contrary to all conceptions of human nature to suppose that these three gentlemen could resist the pressure brought to bear upon them. Those were the two chief considerations which prompted him to move the omission of Clause 1. There were other minor points which made the clause unjust. It should contain a provision with regard to the amount to be paid by the Commissioners for the grass land which formed a large portion of the land to be acquired by the Commissioners under this Bill, and stringent regulations should be made to compel the Commissioners to pay the market value of the land. It was an axiom of English law that if anything was taken away from any person for the public benefit the loss should not fall on him, but on the persons benefited. Some conditions or directions ought also to be inserted in the clause compelling the Commissioners to offer, not what they thought was a proper price, but the real market value of the land. If a man was to have land taken from him compulsorily they should give him the full market value, and if possible a further sum because of the compulsory acquisition. That was the ordinary procedure in cases of compulsory acquisition, and if that were done he did not think that there would be very much need to complain. But there was nothing in the Bill which would ensure that the tenant would receive the full market value. In the Minutes of Evidence before the Commissioners on Congested Districts the various witnesses had different ideas as to what the value of grass lands should be. It had been stated that Mr. Finucane, one of the Commissioners, had certain ideas as to the value of grass lands which if carried out would not give the owners the full value of those lands. Therefore, there should be included in the Bill specific directions which would make it incumbent on the Estates Commissioners, or on the Court of Appeal which it was hoped would be incorporated later in this measure, to give the top market value for the land. [" Tip-top."] An hon. Member suggested tip-top; he had no objection. He thought it perfectly reasonable that where land was taken compulsorily the full market value should be given. [" Hear, hear."] The Chief Secretary cheered that, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would, before the Bill left the House, so alter the clause as to carry that out. Hon. Members on his side of the House thought that before the Estates Commissioners were allowed to acquire these holdings or any holdings compulsorily, the proposal to acquire them should be put before some independent tribunal, he thought it ought to be the Judicial Commissioner. Reference had been made by the learned Attorney-General to the analogy to be found in the Labourer's Act passed last year, and he had said that this Bill was drawn up in strict conformity with the provisions of that enactment. But he thought they had proved to the House that this Bill in its essentials differed absolutely from the Labourers Act, for under that measure the rural district council, when acquiring land for the purpose of erecting upon it labourers cottages, had to draw up a scheme which was submitted to a separate tribunal altogether, namely, an inspector sent down by the Local Government Board to make inquiry. They thought the same thing might be done under this Bill, and that where the Estates Commissioners desired to acquire land, whether tenanted or untenanted, for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants, they should have to put their proposal before the Judicial Commissioner, who should inquire into the reasonableness of taking the land. He thought that was a very reasonable suggestion, and that the clause should be left out of the Bill. He freely admitted that these reasons, although they applied to the first clause, were equally against the whole Bill, roughly speaking. In view of the inordinate and extraordinary powers to be given to the Commissioners to apply compulsion where compulsion was not necessary, and the proposals to take untenanted land, while placing no restrictions on the Estates Commissioners, he opposed this clause. He begged to move.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT, in seconding the Amendment, said he thought that the whole aim and scope of this clause had been very clearly defined by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, who a short time ago had said that they were going to reward those who had broken the law while those who had obeyed the law were to be turned out to starve. The hon. Member for South Tyrone at a meeting the other day had stated that he (Mr. Corbett) had changed his views on the question of compulsory purchase. [" No."] He had not changed his views, and he was very glad that the hon. Member had not meant to taunt him with having done so. At all events the hon. Member had interrupted him during his speech by throwing that taunt across the floor of the House. He had not changed his views, and he was still prepared to carry out compulsion to give full effect to the Act of 1903. But he did not confine the benefits of compulsion as the hon. Member for South Tyrone did to dishonest men. They felt that they had to protect the tenants of the North of Ireland and the honest tenants in the South and West of Ireland; but this proposal went far to paralyse the normal working of the Act of 1903. The right hon. Gentleman must know even with his short acquaintance with Ireland that contracts had been entered into between landlords and tenants for the sale of approaching to £50,000,000 worth of land in Ireland. Some £20,000,000 had already been provided, and they were simply waiting for the remaining £30,000,000, which was wanted to carry out these contracts between honest men who had done their duty and the landlords who were willing to sell. [An Hon. Member: " Where are they ? "] Where were they ? They were throughout all Ireland. The work of carrying out these contracts was going to be stopped by giving a preference to men who a quarter of a century ago were turned out of their farms because they would not pay their rents. The hon. Member for South Tyrone laughed, but he knew that the facts were exactly as he had stated them. He had quoted the words of the hon. Member, and he had a long string of quotations from speeches of the hon. Gentleman in his pocket. What they proposed to do in behalf of these men was most iniquitous; if they wanted to do anything for them let the State do it and do it generously, but let them not interfere with the working of the Act of 1903, or with the carrying out of that for which great numbers of tenants were anxiously waiting—men to whom the hon. Member for South Tyrone used to promise the fulfilment of their hopes, but with whom he was now going to interfere in behalf of another class.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Craig.*)

Question proposed, " That the clause down to the word ' land ' in line 6 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said the hon. Member had stated that under the Act of 1903 those for whom they legislated were the political evicted tenants, or the Plan of Campaign tenants. The hon. Gentleman had also stated that of seventeen estates fifteen had been dealt with, and the cases of the evicted on those fifteen estates had been settled. He ventured to say that when the Land Act of 1903 was going through what the hon. Gentleman had stated was not the fact. As he understood, the *bona-fide* evicted tenants since 1879 were to be reinstated, if not in their original holdings, in other holdings of an equivalent character. They knew that in 1879 the Plan of Campaign was not started, and he ventured to submit that what the hon. Gentleman had stated was not the fact.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG said he did not deny that they had now to deal with evicted tenants of all sorts. He had only said that at the time of the passing of the Act of 1903 very few persons realised that they had to deal with a very large number of non-political evicted tenants. What they had thought was that they had only to deal with the Plan of Campaign tenants.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said he differed from the hon Member. They knew that a great number of these evicted tenant cases had not been settled, and that for four years negotiations with the Commissioners and their inspectors had been going on. Many of the landlords would not consent to the reinstatement of their tenants, and there were many farms in the occupation of "grabbers" which the holders would not give up, although under the Act of 1903 the Estates Commissioners had power to grant them compensation. To settle this question by compulsion was, therefore, absolutely necessary. He wished to congratulate the Chief Secretary upon the courageous manner in which he had tackled the question. He hoped the measure would pass into law as it stood, and if it did it would bring happiness to a most deserving class, and peace and prosperity to Ireland.

Mr. BIRRELL said that if he lived to be a hundred he would never be able to understand the notion which some hon. Gentlemen opposite had of what constituted debate. The objections which had now been stated had been repeated over and over again in the course of the proceedings on this Bill. and he was much more impressed by them the first time he heard them than the last. The hon. Member opposite said it afforded him great pleasure to re-register his protest against the Bill. There was, however, only one way of discussing a Bill properly, and that was to proceed from point to point, and after making them clear proceed to other points and state their objections to them. Hon. Members opposite had their own conception of what debate was and their powers, and if they were satisfied by saying the same thing over and over again and derived pleasure from it, of course the Government were powerless in the matter, and the Bill would go to another place with a number of its clauses undiscussed. Those clauses might have been discussed that evening. Why did not hon. Members proceed to other points? There were other matters which admitted of, and were deserving of, discussion, and on which Amendments might perhaps be accepted. By-and-bye it would be said that a number of the clauses had not been discussed at all, but they might have discussed them that evening.

MR. T. L. CORBETT asked whether the right hon. Gentleman ought not to confine himself to the clause.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said the right hon. Gentleman was replying to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. BIRRELL: I will say no more.

MR. WALTER LONG said the right hon. Gentleman had had much experience in other walks of life, but not a very long experience of passing Bills through that House.

MR. BIRRELL: I have never had anything like this.

MR. WALTER LONG said it was all very well for the Chief Secretary to lecture the Opposition for the time they had taken up in discussing this measure so far, but he knew perfectly well that the Government had made the closure a necessary part of their policy in carrying legislation. Therefore it was idle to talk about adequate time having been allowed for discussion. Nobody deplored more than he did any legislation which was not adequately discussed, but adequate discussion was rendered impossible under the system adopted by the Government. There was only one way of proceeding under the closure, and that was for the Government to constitute themselves the sole judges as to what it was necessary to discuss and what not. The right hon. Gentleman said they had been discussing points which were of no importance, and had repeated over and over again the same arguments. He himself had been Minister in charge of a Bill more than once, and he never felt so sick as he did when the Opposition repeated arguments which he felt had weight and which he had difficulty in answering. What the right hon. Gentleman objected to was not speeches which he could answer, but the repetition of arguments which he admitted himself had some weight the first time he heard them, but had since lost their weight by repetition. If an argument had force the first time it was used surely it did not lose its force by repetition. Hon. Members below the gangway said the Opposition were opposing this Bill because they were opposed to the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. [NATIONALIST cries of "Hear, hear!"] He made no complaint of that argument, because in politics as in other things different ways of fighting were justifiable. The Unionist Members were not opposing this Bill because they were opposed to the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. On the contrary, they accepted the view that the evicted tenants were to be reinstated, and the majority of his friends had not denied that it might be necessary to resort to compulsion in certain cases. But that did not mean that any form of compulsion exercised in any way was justified just because there was need of some compulsory powers. Two things ought to be proved—first, that compulsory powers were needed in order to meet a public need, and, secondly, that they would be exercised with such precautions as would secure justice for those against whom they would be exercised, as well as justice for those in whose favour they would be exercised. Clause 1 gave a right for compulsory powers to be exercised by a Department of the Irish Government without control, without appeal, and without any limitation. They were quite justified in saying that by this Bill they were conferring powers of an unprecedented character. Not one precedent for such compulsory powers had been given except by the hon. and learned Member for Louth, who alluded to a private Bill dealing with a certain part of London. The right hon. Gentleman complained that the Opposition had been repeating arguments over and over again. Certainly they had repeated arguments, and nobody denied it. The point upon which they had repeated them was the main principle of the Bill, and the rest of the measure consisted of comparatively small and unimportant matters relating to machinery. By this Bill they were conferring unlimited powers upon the Estates Commissioners. He had never said a word against the members of that Commission, for he had always held that every permanent official should be safe from attack in the House of Commons. Whenever he had had to speak of the action of civil servants he had never attacked them. The permanent officials could not stand up in that House and defend themselves. He had pointed out, however, that these particular public servants were in an exceptional position. They could act independently, as it were, and they could give expression to opinions such as those quoted earlier in the debate.. That necessarily exposed them to the criticism of those who did not believe that their opinions were well founded. It was to these men that exceptional powers were to be given. If these officials were given further powers without any control from the Administration, the Government could not complain if the conduct of these officials was made the subject of criticism in that House. The Opposition believed that these compulsory powers should be in the hands of an independent tribunal, subject to the administration, who could answer for them; and secondly, that these powers should be surrounded by such limitations as would secure that those who appeared before the tribunal should have the right of presenting their case. That right was denied under this Bill. He resented the charge which had been made by a Nationalist Member that the Opposition wished to keep this question of evicted tenants alive for political purposes, and in order to attack the Nationalist Party in Ireland. He did not blame hon. Members below the gangway for fighting hard, but such an attack was utterly unworthy of any opponents, no matter how strong their views might be. The Opposition believed that the evicted tenants should be put back under certain limitations and under certain conditions, but to say that because they held these views they were bound to accept this Bill without discussion, for that was what it amounted to, was to make a preposterous demand, and, although the Opposition were small in number, they would nevertheless persist in opposition to the measure, and they would be in no way deterred by the criticisms of the Chief Secretary, which they believed to be as unfounded as they believed their own attitude to be thoroughly justified.

MR. A. ROCHE (Cork) thought he could claim to have more personal experience on the question of the evicted tenants, and particularly those in connection with the Clanricarde estate, than any other man in or out of Parliament. What was the condition of affairs there at the present moment? There were between fifty and sixty families still unsettled in connection with the Clanricarde estate. During all the years which had passed since they were evicted there had never been more than eight new tenants or planters on the estate. The holdings which were formerly occupied by the evicted tenants had been grouped together to form larger farms for the planters. These tenants had been described as industrious, hard-working, and reliable men, but he would point out that some of them had left the estate without paying the rent for the years they had been in occupation of the farms, and the remainder had run away, not only in debt to Lord Clanricarde, but to others from whom they had obtained credit. There were tenants in other districts also, who had been served with writs on account of the rent being unpaid, and others had received notice to quit. He maintained that unless the Estates Commissioners had compulsory powers to acquire land, it would be utterly impossible to deal with the estates of Lord Clanricarde and certain other landlords. There were other districts in the neighbourhood in which exactly similar conditions prevailed. Some planters had been cleared out, others had writs for rent served upon them, and others had received notice to quit. He maintained that it would be the duty of the Government to come to the relief of these men with compulsory power, so that they should get something for clearing out.

MR. BARRIE said he had an Amendment to this clause dealing with tenanted as compared with untenanted land. He was anxious that the compulsory powers under the clause should be limited to untenanted land. They were all aware that the Commissioners had stated that 80,000 acres of land would be necessary to reinstate the evicted tenants. He most respectfully submitted that the Government should very seriously consider whether they were warranted in taking the large powers which they claimed under this Bill. They had heard many descriptions as to the worthlessness of the planter tenants. It was no part of his duty to say that all the planters were eligible agriculturists, but many of them had proved themselves to be so. They had tilled their farms in a manner satisfactory to their landlords, and he felt that it was very revolutionary that a measure should be passed to take from them the farms which they were properly cultivating and hand them over to those of whom the less the House heard the better. Certainly they would not be better farmers than those whom they were to dispossess. Under the Land Purchase Act of 1905, no fewer than 150,000 tenants had already become by voluntary arrangement the owners of the soil which they cultivated, but if they took another section who had not been able to purchase under the provisions of that Act, and reinstated them in their old holdings, they would be putting the latter in a better position than the honest tenants. That was neither the spirit nor the intention of the Act of 1903. He had always maintained that compulsion would have to come for the balance of the tenants not yet reinstated, but he was now speaking of the rent-paying tenants who had fulfilled all their honourable obligations. He supported the Amendment in the interests of his constituents, who were largely composed of tenant farmers.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 296 ; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 335.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'rHamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J. T. (Ches.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'll
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. (Colchester)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Centr'l
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, G'v'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES — Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. Lonsdale.

And, it being half-past Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to the order of the House of 22nd July, successively to put forthwith the Question upon any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given.

Amendment made—

"In page 1, line 6, after the word 'Act,' to insert the words 'and if they have offered to the person appearing to them to be the owner of the land a price which appears to them to represent the fair market value thereof, and he has not within the prescribed time accepted the offer.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

" In page 1, line 14, after ' 1903,' to insert the words ' who, or whose predecessors, were evicted from their holdings before the passing of the said Act in consequence of proceedings taken by or on behalf of their landlords, and ' "—(*Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.*)

Question put, " That the Amendment be made."

The House divided :—Ayes, 301 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 336.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (City Lond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beach, Hn. Hichael Hugh Hicks
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Findlay, Alexander
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gretton, John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edmd's
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Keswick, William
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mackarness, Frederic C.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)

Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nield, Herbert
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson, JohnFrederick Peel
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset,E
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Turnour, Viscount
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Byles, William Pollard
Clynes, J. R.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Crean, Euguene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Delany, William
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal, E.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Mooney, J. J.
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T.F(Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Seddon, J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Snowden, P.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)

Thorne, William
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page **2**, line 9, at the end, to insert the words, 'For the purposes of this enactment a person shall be deemed to be a tenant notwithstanding that he may have agreed to purchase his holding, if the agreement was entered into after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and seven, and if the holding has not become vested in him as a purchaser under the Land Purchase Acts.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 310; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 337.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. Worc r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift

MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, W.
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh, Central
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea,Walter Russel (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson,J.W.H(Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmanann
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh., N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whitley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark, Govan
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gretton, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd)
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'd's)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Rt.Hon.Walter (Dublin,S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staffsh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES — Viscount Castlereagh and Mr. George Faber.

Amendment made—

'In page 3, line 27, after the word 'serve,' to insert the words 'in the prescribed manner.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to thy Bill on Consideration, as amended (be the Standing Committee) [July 19th].

Which Amendment was—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out paragraph (*b*) of Clause 3."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words 'with the leave of the' stand part of the Bill."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) thought there was a general opinion in the House in favour of an appeal on a question of law. His hon. and learned friend the Member for Cambridge University argued this matter out very ably upon the last occasion when the Bill was considered, and he did not think they could make much progress with the debate until they had heard the view of the Government upon the point. He asked the Attorney-General to say whether he was prepared to accept the Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said thas the aim of this Bill was to establish an effective tribunal of review; to constitute a Court of Appeal, and then to confine it within hard legal limits would entirely destroy its usefulness. To say that the Court should hear arguments on points of law, and treat all findings of fact as conclusively established, would be to reduce the Court to futility. The effort to discriminate between questions of fact and questions of law was legally, if not intellectually, impossible. The two regions of law and fact were so closely intermingled that to attempt to discriminate would seriously hamper the efforts of the tribunal they were creating under this Bill. If this Amendment were made, and if the Court came to the conclusion that there was no evidence in support of a particular proposition, they would have to quash the conviction. But if they came to the conclusion that there was some evidence, however untrustworthy and insufficient, they would be compelled to sustain the verdict. All such matters as the misapprehension of the Judges, and the misleading of the jury, that made criminal trials sometimes unsatisfactory and that were every day considered by the Home Secretary, would be excluded from the purview of the Court.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke) said he desired to place before the House one ground on which he was resolutely opposed to any appeal on facts, as distinguished from law, in criminal cases. Putting aside all the many other legal reasons which could be urged with considerable strength against an appeal on fact, the one ground which conclusively weighed with him was the effect which he was satisfied it could not fail to have on the attitude with which a jury would approach the trial of any doubtful case. At present it was the undoubted and happy fact that juries in this country in criminal cases did in fact acquit in doubtful cases. It was always said that they did so because they were so instructed by the Judge, but he was quite satisfied himself that the reason why juries invariably acquitted in doubtful cases was not in the least because they were instructed to do so by the Judge, but because it was the easiest and most natural course for them to take in the circumstances. If they imagined a jury debating a doubtful case, it was obvious that those of the jury who were in favour of acquittal must ultimately prevail against those who were inclined to a more serious view. The main reason was that the verdict they were about to pronounce was a final verdict. If the verdict they were about to pronouce was not to be final, not only did they remove the present tendency to acquittal, but they substituted for it a very strong tendency to convict. They enlisted on the side of conviction that very tendency to take the line of least resistance which now produced the tendency to acquit. The jury would say to themselves: "If in this case we acquit our verdict is final. Half our number are inclined to think that the man has been proved to be guilty, and that if we let him off we shall be failing in our public duty. That will be the result if we acquit; but that will not be the result if we convict. The man will not go to prison except for a day or two, after which he will be out on bail running about preparing his defence. The question which is puzzling us as to his guilt or innocence will be shifted from our shoulders on to the broader shoulders of gentlemen in London who exist for the purpose of settling these knotty points." That was the way in which a jury would argue so soon as a one-sided appeal on fact was allowed—an appeal open to the accused, but not open to the prosecution. It was because he was satisfied it would produce that result, and, in so doing, take away an all-important safeguard which we had in our criminal administration at the present time that he should persist to the last in his opposition to any attempt to introduce an appeal on fact.

LORD R. CECIL said he had the misfortune to differ from his hon. and learned friend on this point, and he trusted that the Government would adhere to the provision in the Bill. He personally had a very limited admiration for trial by jury. He had never thought that trial by jury was a particularly good method of arriving at the truth in many cases. It had its advantages, because it diminished the responsibility; it divided the responsibility that rested on any individual man by twelve, and that was an advantage, at any rate, when they had to deal with serious matters. It had other advantages of a technical nature which he need not describe. He doubted whether a jury were ruled by the elaborate and scientific reasoning which necessarily appealed to his hon. and learned friend. They did not consider, he did not suppose that they knew, whether their verdict was or was not final. What they would consider was the effect which the evidence made upon them, and the effect, possibly in a lesser degree, of counsel's speeches, but the most important effect upon them was that produced by the presiding Judge in summing up. Therefore, if they wanted to arrive at what the result of the change proposed by the Attorney-General would be, they must consider much more what would be the effect on the Judge of setting up a Court of Appeal than upon the jury. His opinion was that the fact that there was an appeal in cases where there was a conviction would be to make the Judge more careful in advising a jury to convict than at present. A Judge disliked to have his judgments reversed on appeal, and he would not care in criminal cases to have convictions quashed on appeal. He did not say that this would make any impartial man keep awake at night, but it would make a Judge more careful than at present not to run the risk of convicting a man if there was any reasonable doubt of his guilt. Therefore the effect of the Bill would be to make the Judge more careful and not to have an appreciable effect on the jury. Might he enter a slight protest against the phrase "tendency to acquit"? After all, it was not their object to have a tendency to acquit or a tendency to convict; it was their object to get a perfectly fair decision. He believed the appeal would be quite as valuable on matters of fact as on matters of law, and he should support the Bill as it at present stood.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR said that he understood the Attorney-General to say that it was quite impossible to discriminate between questions of fact and questions of law. He asked how, if that was the case, at the present moment it was possible to discriminate between questions of law and fact in cases of appeal to Quarter Sessions?

SIR JOHN WALTON was understood to say that the tribunal to be established would be an efficient tribunal of review. In civil cases there were rules by which a discrimination was made between questions of fact and questions of law; but it would destroy the whole value of the new tribunal if those rules were made applicable to criminal cases.

*SIR W. ANSON (Oxford University) said he was by no means averse to an appeal on matters of fact subject to limitations. If this Amendment were carried the Government would have to limit and define the right so as to secure that it would be only in important cases that an appeal on matters of fact should be allowed. The Bill as it stood at present gave a perfectly unlimited right of appeal. He confessed he was surprised to hear the Attorney-General say that it was difficult to distinguish between questions of law and facts in criminal cases. He should have thought that for generations the provinces of the Judge and of the jury were sufficiently distinguishable. The Attorney-General seemed to hold that there was no distinction in principle between cases in which a Judge would now declare that there was no evidence of a particular kind to go to the jury, and cases in which the Court of Appeal might lay it down that there was not sufficient evidence to convict the prisoner. These were two quite different things. In one case the Judge defined the crime and settled a question of law; in the other the Court considered the amount and value of evidence and decided a question of fact. He did not agree that an appeal on matters of fact was desirable unless in special circumstances. What effect, he asked, would this measure have on the responsibility of the Judge and the jury? His noble friend said that the main responsibility was with the Judge when he came to sum up. No doubt there was a great deal of responsibility on a Judge in summing up; but he maintained that the jury likewise possessed a heavy sense of responsibility in coming to their decision, because they knew that it would be final. But if the jury knew that the whole matter would come up for revision before the Court of Criminal Appeal, whether they were right or wrong, they would have a comfortable sense that, if they went wrong, no great harm would ensue. His objection to this right of appeal to a new tribunal was that it was indiscriminate. He thought that it was a pity this matter had been taken up by lawyers engaged usually in important cases of the character of *causes célèbres*, and not in small criminal business.

SIR JOHN WALTON said that he had practised at Quarter Sessions for seven years, and he ought to know.

*SIR W. ANSON maintained that the Bill as it stood gave a perfectly unlimited and therefore a dangerous right of appeal. He did not agree that appeals in matters of fact were desirable unless in special circumstances. Would the Court of Criminal Appeal be effective if at the outset it was clogged with an enormous number of appeals? He could not help feeling that this general offer of an appeal would be taken advantage of by every class of criminal and not merely by those concerned in important and intricate cases worthy of the consideration of the Court. If that was so, then though there might be three Courts, and it was possible for them to sit at the same time, they would have their hands full of business, and appeals would be delayed and the other business in which these Judges should have been employed would be set aside. Thus they would not merely weaken the responsibility of juries, but they would damage the character of the Court at the outset from the delays that would ensue.

MR. J. O'CONNOR said the House had witnessed a very pretty duel between the man of theory and the man of practice. He thought their decision should be in favour of the man of practice. The hon. Member for Oxford University had admitted that he would be in favour of a Court of Appeal if there were limitations. He ventured to point out that there was a very serious limitation which was appeal for leave to appeal. There was no reason why the distinction between law and fact should be maintained any longer because it could, and would, be got rid of from time to time. This Amendment was supported by hon. Members who had prepared hundreds of notices of appeal, and in every case they had been able to convert questions of fact into questions of law. The clause gave the protection asked for by the Member for Oxford University in the limitation contained in the words "with the leave of the Court of Criminal Appeal."

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover-square), said he was strongly in favour of the Amendment. He had really heard no answer throughout these debates to the unworkable and costly character of this measure if appeals on the facts were to remain in. Unworkability and costliness had been brushed aside in these debates as being of no weight as compared with justice and clemency, and if it were a fact that an appeal to the Court of Appeal would be in favour of the convicted man, and in favour of clemency, he agreed that those arguments should be thrust aside. But his firm conviction was that the present form of criminal law was all in favour of the convicted man, who not only had all the advantage which arose from the rigidity of the system with regard to evidence in the Court, but all the advantage of the less rigid and more flexible system of the inquiry by the Home Office. The suggestion was made by learned Judges that the criminal should have the right of referring these questions to a Court of law and that the public should have an opportunity of demanding some explanation. That was what was done in the case of Mr. Beck. He did not press too much the unanimous judgment of the Judges on the point, but what he proposed was that they should try this plan and see if it would abate public dissatisfaction, before they sent all these cases which dealt with questions of fact to a Court of Criminal Appeal, took the risk of making our present system unworkable and giving rise to the scandals which arose from delay in trials in America and elsewhere by reason of time being taken up in appeal. He believed that the course proposed would diminish the responsibility of both Judge and jury and that it would be shaken. His noble friend began by saying that he had very little opinion of or admiration for juries, but then he did not seem to have an overwhelming admiration for Judges either, because he seemed to suggest that in future they would, if this Bill were passed, conduct criminal trials with more care because of the fear of their decisions being reversed. For himself, however, he thought that a criminal case doubled the attention of the tribunal because the result was final. That fact had a great effect upon both juries and Judges. He thought that by this Bill they were running a great risk of diminishing that sense of responsibility. Nobody with knowledge of human nature, who had had the experience of criminal trials, would deny that at the close of a long sitting and at the end of a complicated case, if this Bill were passed there would not be that shrinking from finding a connection between the prisoner and the crime where there was an element of doubt that there now was, as there would be the knowledge that the decision would be open to revision. He therefore supported the Amendment.

*MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) thought the Government were well advised in giving the Bill the wide scope that they had given it. Some years ago he himself had introduced a Court of Criminal Appeal Bill into the House, which was based on the recommendation of the Judges, but in the course of the debate it became clear that even the House of Commons of that day was in favour of a wider Bill.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said that at the present moment behind the jury they had the Home Secretary, who was able to sift the evidence in a case by whatever means he pleased, and he thought that that position of things was better than would be secured by the possession of a Court of Criminal Appeal. At present the Home Secretary was not bound by any rules of evidence as a Court of Criminal Appeal would be. Of course a good deal depended upon who was Home Secretary, and no doubt it was a great responsibility to put upon one individual, but it seemed to him that if a man in the position of Home Secretary entered upon the inquiry into these matters without any trammels which would be imposed upon a Court of Criminal Appeal, he would be more able to get at the true inwardness of a case than such a Court would be. There seemed to him to be no power in the Bill under which the Court of Criminal Appeal could hear fresh evidence, but the Home Secretary could, if he desired it, go into fresh evidence and discover from it what the real truth and inwardness of a case was. The question as to the lessening of the responsibility of the jury was a very serious one. It was obvious that their responsibility would be weakened if they knew that they had a Court of Appeal behind them. That was a point of view which had been held by many others, and it certainly impressed itself upon him.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) said that on this occasion he found himself in the unique position of being a warm supporter of the Government. The proposal before the House was that there should be an appeal on questions of law only, but as he understood it this right did exist at present, although the Judge might refuse to reserve the point of law for the consideration of the Court for Crown Cases Reserved. All they wanted if the amendment was to be accepted was that the Court for the Consideration of Crown Cases Reserved should have the right by *mandamus* to compel the people to state a case for their opinion. In that case the present Bill would be unnecessary. But what the country demanded was that a man whose liberty was imperilled should have as much right to appeal as a man who had been mulcted in a £10 note.

Mr. BUCKMASTER (Cambridge) said he was a confirmed opponent of a principle which allowed an extensive right of appeal on questions of fact. To his mind the division between questions of fact and questions of law was clear and distinct. It was perfectly true that all questions of law must have application to questions of fact, but the principles of law that they applied were totally distinct from the facts to which they addressed them, and no better illustration could be given than that which occurred every day in the civil Courts in the findings of fact by a jury, upon which questions of law were argued before the Judge. The distinction was one which was more familiar to the Attorney-General than to any other Member of the House, and he was amazed that the hon. and learned Gentleman should say that the line of distinction between questions of law and questions of fact was so shadowy that it was impossible to distinguish them for the purposes of this Bill. If that were so, why was it that at the present time there was an appeal on questions of law, provided they got the sanction of the Judge, before whom the man was tried, for stating a special case ? There was no appeal on questions of fact at all, and no difficulty with which he was acquainted had ever arisen in defining, for the purposes of a special case, the questions of law it was desired to raise. Further, if they took the case, which undoubtedly created a great public sensation, and which he could not help thinking was present to the minds of hon. Gentlemen who were supporting this Bill—the case of Mr. Beck—they would at once find that the distinctions between questions of law and questions of fact were marked in a most prominent way. Had an appeal on questions of fact existed Mr. Beck might have appealed but he would have appealed in vain. He had studied the evidence with some care, and he said without hesitation that there was no lawyer who had ever been acquainted with the work of the Court of Appeal who would have ventured to have advised an appeal on a question of fact in that case. But, had there been an appeal on a question of law, the man would have been free, because the miscarriage of justice was due to the fact that the learned Judge, who was trying the case, mistakenly refused to admit certain evidence that was tendered to him, and declined to state a special case as to whether or not it was admissible. It was purely and simply a question of law entirely divorced and dissociated from any question of fact whatever. If these things were distinct, as he thought they were, then there must be some special reasons for the opposition to appeals on questions of fact. These reasons had been stated on previous occasions, and he had never heard an answer to them. It was idle for his hon. and learned friend who sat on the bench opposite to say that the objection to the Bill arose from men of theory and not from men of practice. He greatly doubted if there was in that House a man better acquainted with the practice and administration of the criminal law than the hon. and learned Member for the Kingston division, and yet he believed the hon. Gentleman was as strong an opponent as he was himself of this provision. And again, the hon. and learned Member for the University of Cambridge was a man who had administered the criminal law as Recorder of Cambridge for years past, and he also was opposed to it. The hon. and learned Gentleman who had just spoken had no mean practical experience of the administration of the criminal law, and he likewise was opposed to it. It was idle to suggest that they were divided in that House between men of practice and men of theory. It was not so, or if it were so, the men of practice were the men who took the same view as he took himself, and he admitted that his view was to some extent tainted by a theoretical and not a practical knowledge. The main objection to this appeal on a question of fact could be stated in a few sentences. There were in all cases, in all sessions and assizes and criminal Courts, clear and distinct classes of cases. There was the case of the man who was clearly innocent and the case of the man who was clearly guilty, and between the two there was a dim and uncertain border, and in the shadows of which it might be that many a guilty man escaped, but in which the innocent were not involved. If they passed this Bill and allowed appeal on questions of fact they would take away those shadows, and the innocent man would run great risk of being convicted, when at the present moment he would undoubtedly escape. Let such a thing arise, and no Court of Appeal would ever set it right. They could not possibly by any Court of Appeal in the world readjust difficult and complicated questions of fact upon which a jury had once pronounced. That was the reason which influenced him in opposing the Second Reading of this Bill and in supporting, as he was bound from his conviction to support, the Amendment which the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University had brought forward.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) said the Court of Appeal must at any rate receive an application before it decided whether the appeal was on a question of law or a question of fact. They knew by experience that the jurisdiction which had recently been thrown on the Court of Appeal to hear applications for leave to appeal from chambers or from an inferior Court, or from the Divisional Court, frequently took up a great deal of time; often three-quarters of an hour or an hour was consumed in hearing *ex parte* applications for leave to appeal. These were cases where they had already had applications made and refused either by Judges in chambers or by whatever was the tribunal from which theyappealed. When they regarded for a moment the whole criminal jurisdiction of this country and all the prisoners who would have a right of appeal, he ventured to point out that they would have list upon list occupying this new Appeal Court day by day, in order to ascertain whether there was a *prima facie* case on which to give leave to appeal in order to get such an investigation of the facts as had hitherto been done perfectly satisfactorily by officials of the Home Office. Therefore, in the interests of public time, they ought to interpose some authority to prevent haphazard appeals which would come up from Quarter Sessions, from every petty sessional bench, and from every Assize Court. The Court would be flooded with applications, and their time would be taken up in each case in deciding whether an appeal was on a question of fact or on a question of law. Anybody who knew the attitude of convicted prisoners knew how frequent were the applications to the Home Office by petition for a revision of the sentences. Those who were acquainted with the facts knew that numbers of prisoners in gaol applied to the Home Office or to the visiting magistrate for revision on the ground that their sentences were wrong; and these cases alone, if they were taken to the Court of Appeal, would at once speedily overwhelm it with work, and it was therefore necessary that they should consider the condition of things which would be brought about by this Bill if it were passed as it stood.

*Mr. RUFUS ISAACS (Reading) said the proposition of his right hon. friend the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, was that this Bill, with this provision as it at present stood, would be unworkable, but he had found it difficult to understand his arguments why it would be unworkable. It should be borne in mind that no appeal could be presented to the Court of Criminal Appeal until that Court had had established to its own satisfaction that a *prima facie* case had been made out for investigation by that Court. Once that had been established then there was proper subject matter for discussion before the Court of Criminal Appeal. In a civil case there would be no difficulty. Certain views would have to be presented upon which a discussion would be pronounced. Why should there be any difficulty in applying the same principle in a Court of Criminal Appeal with proper safeguards against appeals which were frivolous, or vexatious? The Court of Criminal Appeal would take great care, in determining such matters, that a *prima facie* case was established upon the evidence presented when the application was made.

Mr. LYTTELTON said that would very often be a longer job than hearing the case.

*Mr. RUFUS ISAACS said he would like to remind the right hon. Gentleman of applications which he had made a great many times based upon similar materials which had to be presented to the Court. In applications of the character he alluded to, the Court did not go at great length into these matters, because counsel had had an opportunity of digesting the facts, and consequently the case was presented to the Court in such a manner that it was not difficult to determine whether a *prima facie* case had been made out. He submitted to his right hon. friend that there would be no difficulty in the matter. He agreed that probably some time would be occupied, but the point was that it would be usefully occupied. It was necessary in criminal cases that there should be some right of appeal to an open Court and not to the Home Secretary, who had to determine cases on material which they never saw. Such appeals should be decided upon material presented to a Court which would deal with the matter judicially, and it was because the Government had come to the conclusion that it was necessary that the same right should be extended in criminal cases, with the limitations imposed as in civil cases, that this clause had been introduced. He submitted that the arguments which had been presented against this section of the Bill made the case of the Government stronger. He had been much struck by the arguments of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University, who said that he failed to understand how there would be any difficulty in distinguishing between questions of law and questions of fact. Under this Bill, and in numberless cases which would occur to the hon. and learned Member, the question which might arise was one of mixed law and fact. How in that case would they distinguish between what was law and what was fact? It would at once be seen how difficult it was in some cases to draw the line between the two. He agreed that in a great number of cases there would be no difficulty. There would be the point of law arising upon a certain set of facts, but they might have a set of facts, upon which there would be real difficulty in determining at what precise point the question discussed ceased to be a question of fact and became a question of law. It was in order to get over those niceties that this clause had been introduced, so that justice might be done without paying an over-sensitive regard to those rules which applied in civil cases. When an an appeal was given not only on a question of law but on a question of fact, the Court could pronounce a judgment which would be in accordance with the justice of the case. The Court might come to the conclusion that the law as laid down was right and that the findings as to the facts were wrong. Under this Amendment, in spite of the Court having come to the conclusion that the finding upon a question of fact was wrong, although the finding as to law was right, the Court of Criminal Appeal could not interfere to redress that injustice, although every member of the Court was of the same opinion. They ought to remember that this was not a question for lawyers at all, and he protested against its being regarded as a matter upon which lawyers only should speak. They were seeking to establish a safeguard so that no innocent man should be convicted. If they appealed to those who were not already steeped in the practice of the law; if they appealed to the general public and to the minds of jurymen and magistrates the reply would be that if they wished to do justice in a case of criminal appeal they must be able to try both questions of fact and questions of law. The experience of those who had practised in Courts of law was that questions of fact were very often more difficult to determine than questions of law, and the sifting of the evidence upon which a question of fact was to be determined was often a matter of the greatest nicety. It should be borne in mind that the Court of Criminal Appeal must have regard to those rules and principles upon which the Court of Appeal decided in civil cases and consequently there was no danger. He did not think that ultimately there would be many appeals on fact. He was ready to concede that at the outset there might be a number of such appeals. It would be found in criminal cases that appeals on questions of fact, would be dealt with on the same principles as appeals on fact in civil cases. Arguments had been addressed to the House based upon the want of responsibility in juries if once this Criminal Appeal Bill became law. He was astonished to hear an argument which fell from the lips of his right hon. and learned friend the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, who seemed to think that a jury in a criminal case, being anxious to get home, would convict a prisoner—whereas, otherwise they would have acquitted him—because there was a Court of Criminal Appeal which might set the matter right. Surely that was doing a great injustice to jurymen. He ventured to say that the experience of those who practised before juries was that hitherto the juries, if in doubt, would come to the conclusion, and rightly so, that the prisoner must be acquitted, not because he must have "the benefit of the doubt"—a very objectionable phrase—but because the prosecution had failed to bring home to the prisoner the guilt which it set out to establish against him. He believed, as he had said, that the argument which had been used did a great injustice to those who sat as jurymen and assisted in the administration of justice in this country. He was convinced that this Bill as presented by the Government would really work justice, and he asked the House to come to that conclusion and to reject the Amendment.

MR. RAWLINSON said that the Bill, as the hon. and learned Member on the other side had said, had been before the House on previous occasions, though in a slightly different form. On both those occasions the opinion of the Judges was taken before the opinion of the House was asked for, and, surely, if anybody had practical knowledge of the working of the criminal law the Judges had. He asked hon. Members, could they find a single Judge who was in favour of an unlimited right of appeal? He had put before the House three reasons for adopting the Amendment. The first was that the unlimited right of asking for leave to appeal rendered the Bill unworkable; secondly, it weakened the responsibility of juries; and, thirdly, it was against the interests of prisoners, because it weakened the position of the Home Secretary in dealing with prisoners who had been convicted. As regarded the first reason, the hon. and learned Member for Reading, if he might say so with respect, missed the point. The hon. and learned Member said that there would be very few appeals in these cases. Very likely, but there was an unlimited right to apply for leave to appeal. Referring to what his right hon. and learned friend had said as to the length of time that might be taken up by the applications, the hon. and learned Member said that counsel would have it in their power to shorten the proceedings. He appeared to have forgotten then, however, that no counsel would be before that Court. The prisoner would be in gaol, and he would have no right to come before the Court unless the Court themselves gave him leave. Of course if he had money enough that prisoner could pay a couple of counsel, but the strong probability was that in the vast majority of cases prisoners would not be able to do this. As he had pointed out, one of two things would happen. Either cases would be gone into in a perfunctory way, in which case the whole thing would resolve itself into a sham, or else there would be a block of work which would make the system impossible. He wished to deal with one other point referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Reading, and also by the learned Attorney-General. The learned Attorney-General pointed out that there would be the greatest difficulty in discriminating between a point of law and a point of fact. He would like with the permission of the House to read a few words from a speech made by the Attorney-General in days when he was nearer the seven years experience of practice in Quarter Sessions of which he had told the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman was dealing with the Bill of 1898. He said—

> "But it cannot be argued that you need to establish a Court of Criminal Appeal in order to ensure the serious and efficient conduct by the Judges of this country of criminal proceedings. If there should be any misconduct on the part of a Judge charged with the administration of criminal law, there is an ample remedy in the functions discharged by the Secretary of State for the Home Office. It cannot be argued that this Bill is necessary in order to prevent errors of law on the part of the tribunal existing."

The hon. and learned Attorney-General went on to say in that speech that the existing machinery was amply sufficient. Then he continued—

> "I am sure I shall be borne out by my hon. and learned friends familiar with the administration of the law when I say that the difficulties arising owing to the construction of the statutes are so few, and the administration of the criminal courts, in so far as it involves questions of criminal law, so easy that no practical necessity can justify the present proposal. Therefore, the sole ground upon which the proposed legislation rests is, that there should be a Court of Appeal for the purpose of correcting errors of fact."

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: That was before the Beck case.

MR. RAWLINSON: Yes; it was in 1898. If the hon. and learned Attorney-General found no difficulty in differentiating between points of law and points of fact in 1898, how could he know say that there was a very great difficulty? But it was not only upon the question of differentiating between questions of law and of fact that the hon. and learned Attorney-General had altered his opinions. Since he moved his Amendment he had had an opportunity of reading the speech of the hon. and learned Attorney-General. He did not propose to detain the House at that late hour by reading it in full, but he was bound to say that no stronger or better speech could have been made in pointing out the dangers of granting an appeal on questions of fact. Perhaps he might be permitted to read this much more from the hon. and learned Attorney-General's speech to the House—

> "If you compare the system of procedure in its civil aspect with the system in its criminal aspect, you will find that in civil procedure the issue is practically defined for the first time, and evidence is laid for the first time when the case is heard. In such a system the equity and fairness of allowing some review with the object of correcting a wrong step is strong and almost irresistible when put forward in the shape of a demand. But in criminal procedure there are various preliminary investigations with the very object of giving finality to the trial. It would, therefore, be a very serious step for this House to interfere with the finality of that procedure. It would be mischievous in any system if there were no means of preventing error; and if no such means existed, and the proposals of this Bill were the only method of correcting mistakes, the argument in its favour would be conclusive; but you have a method of procedure, and all that this Bill proposes is to substitute a different method, a different procedure. You have now the operations of the Home Office. It may be said that the Home Office does not exercise any appellate function, and, theoretically, I do not know that it is necessary for me to contest that proposition. But the Home Office constantly does examine into the case which has been made against a prisoner and the suggestions made in his favour, and does, in effect, exercise an appellate jurisdiction."

The hon. and learned Attorney-General then spoke as to his experience of the excellent work done by the Home Secretary, and continued—

> "If that man (referring to a particular case) had been brought before the proposed new tribunal, there is no doubt but that his sentence would have been carried out. I am quite aware that the prerogative of mercy would still rest with the Home Secretary, but if a prisoner appeals to the Court of Appeal the hand of the Home Secretary will be temporarily stayed, and if the sentence is confirmed by the Court of Appeal his hand will

> be finally stayed, because the Home Secretary will feel that, as the conviction rested not merely on the evidence adduced at the trial, but on the investigation by three judges, it would not be proper for him to advise Her Majesty to remit or alter the sentence. If you erect this Court of Appeal which can only be enlightened in accordance with the strict rules of evidence you will do so at the cost of a procedure infinitely more elastic, more subtle and efficient in its administration, and infinitely more in the interest of the accused person."

No words could put better the arguments in favour of the Amendment. He thought that possibly a good many hon. Members did not fully realise the immense importance of the administration of criminal law in England. It was certainly the most important branch of the legal work done in England, and those who had a practical knowledge of the working of the criminal law had the greatest fear of any alteration in the finality of the verdicts of juries. When that fear was coupled with such remarks as those of the Attorney-General which he had just read to the House, hon. Members must hesitate before they changed their minds in the way the Attorney-General had done. Coming to another of his reasons, they were, as he had said, weakening the position which the Home Secretary had in these matters at the present time. If they passed the Bill the Home Secretary would be unable to interfere before a man had appealed. If a man had appealed, the Home Secretary would be in a much more difficult position as to interfering than he was at present. For the reasons he had stated he asked the House to hesitate before tampering with legal machinery the outcome of years of successful experience. The one part of the English law of which the British public was proud was the administration of the criminal law, and any attempt to destroy the finality of the verdicts of juries who performed their duties honestly would, he was convinced, be attended by unfortunate results. He begged to move the rejection of the clause.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 200; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 338.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch
Asquith,RtHnHerbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonprt)
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton,RtHnRichard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder,Sir John P.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE Martin(Walsall)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)

Jowett, F. W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bertram, Julius
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridsdale, E. A.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Cave and Mr. Salter.

Mr. S. T. EVANS moved to insert after the words "with the leave of" in Paragraph (*b*) the words "the Court by whom the person is convicted or." He would not at that hour detain the House, but what he objected to was the necessity of coming to the Court of Appeal in London. The Amendment was, he thought, both reasonable and necessary on various grounds. In the first place it was necessary on the ground of expense. He commended it also to the House on the score of expedition, and everybody was agreed that if they were to have appeals they should be as expeditious as possible. The only objection he thought which had been offered to the proposal was made by the Attorney-General in Committee, when he argued that it would be unseemly that immediately after the verdict was passed and sentence imposed, especially if it was a serious sentence such as the capital sentence, the person who was defending the prisoner should at once jump up and ask for leave of the Court to appeal. Personally he (Mr. Evans) thought it desirable that, on the two grounds he had stated and on the ground of relieving the prisoner from anxiety, the Court of first instance should be empowered if they thought fit to grant the necessary leave.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, after the words 'the,' to insert the words 'court before whom the person is convicted or of the.'"—(*Mr. Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be inserted in the Bill."

*SIR JOHN WALTON said his hon. and learned friend had stated the grounds upon which he (the Attorney-General) had opposed the Amendment in Committee. He thought the House would be satisfied that there was something in the view he had expressed. It was all-important that the criminal law should be administered with full solemnity. If immediately after verdict and sentence it were open for counsel for the prisoner to rise, and, it might be, with some attempt at dramatic effect, suggest that the verdict of the jury was entitled to no weight, the scene would tend to disparage the administration of justice. He did not think the prisoner's position was in the least degree prejudiced by the plan of the Government. It would be the duty of the Judge to communicate with the Court of Appeal in the form of a report, and there would be little doubt that if that opinion were in favour of an appeal leave would be granted. Applications for appeals should always be matters for consideration; it was very desirable that before any such application was made there should be some opportunity for reflection.

MR. LYTTELTON thought the Attorney-General had given a very strong argument against his own Bill. He had with the greatest justice spoken in favour of the solemnity of criminal trials and had asked the House to reject the Amendment because he imagined there might be a dramatic scene at the end of every criminal trial. That was not a likely occurrence. He had heard a good many dramatic ends to trials, but anybody making such an application would do so with due respect. The position the Attorney-General had placed them in was that beneath the consciousness of every single man in the Court there would be the conviction that the sentence which had just been pronounced could be appealed against. He would go further than that. He would go so far as to say that the Judge while he had the knowledge of the gravity of the crime might say: "But you must remember that the jury and I may have been wrong, and this question which has been tried with so much solemnity may go before these Judges in London." He thought it was worth while mentioning that although he did not agree with the machinery of the Bill the Amendment which had been moved by his hon. and learned friend was recommended by the Royal Commission in 1879, by another Select Committee of that House in 1883, and by the Association of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions last year, and was accepted by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords last year. The Amendment therefore ought to be treated with some respect.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 67; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 339.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie,H.T.Londond)erry, N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bertram, Julius
Bottomley, Horatio
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W, Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridsdale, E. A.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Evans and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cave, George
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Br'df'd
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Soares, Ernest J.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES —Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. RAWLINSON moved an Amendment to provide that the leave which must be given for appeals on grounds involving questions of fact or mixed questions of law and fact should be given by the Home Secretary, and not by the Court of Criminal Appeal itself. He submitted that this was the real solution of the difficulty, and the proper basis for a compromise on which those who differed on the question involved in the Bill should meet. The present position was that there was no appeal on questions of fact, save the informal one to the Home Secretary. He had read the Home Secretary's speech in praise of the work that was being done, and he thoroughly endorsed all that was said in it. He submitted that as a sifting tribunal the Home Secretary was far preferable to the Court of Criminal Appeal. The Home Secretary had a staff at his command and was best able to say whether there was a *prima facie* case for the appeal. If the Home Secretary thought there was a *prima facie* case he could refer it to the Court of Criminal Appeal and get rid of the responsibility. As the Bill stood the Court of Criminal Appeal was not a suitable tribunal to inquire into the fact whether there was a *prima facie* case for appeal. The Court of Criminal Appeal was composed of men accustomed to receiving the assistance of counsel and to hearing people put the facts before them for one side or the other. That was not a suitable tribunal to which a prisoner should send up shorthand notes and leave them to indicate the real points. Such work would be better done by the Home Secretary's department, and in a case where there was the slightest doubt the Home Secretary would undoubtedly have the power to refer the case to the Court of Criminal Appeal. He ventured to press most strongly that the Amendment should be accepted in order that they might obtain what the Bill was intended to obtain. They were taking under the Bill what everybody in the House must admit was an experimental step—it had been referred to by the Attorney-General in a previous Bill as an experiment in criminal law—and if they gave unrestricted right of appeal they were taking a step which was irrevocable. Could there be any harm in taking the first step cautiously? Could there be any harm in giving the right of appeal subject to the sanction of the Home Secretary? If the Amendment worked badly in any way, then it would be time enough for the House to deal with the matter, and extend the provision if they thought necessary. He came across the charge to the grand jury by an eminent Judge of the King's Bench Division the other day. That Judge was in favour of the Bill taken as a whole. He said they agreed that they should give the power of appeal on questions of law and power to enable the Home Secretary to refer cases to the Court of Criminal Appeal. But he (the Judge) could not help thinking that it would be unwise for the present, until there had been a little more experience of the Court of Criminal Appeal, that a universal right of appeal should be given on questions of fact. He (Mr. Rawlinson) ventured to submit that no possible harm could be done to the Bill itself or to the objects which he felt sure the learned Attorney-General meant to carry out by the measure, by adopting this Amendment. He was certain that the Home Secretary could be thoroughly trusted to refer any *prima facie* case to the Court, and the acceptance of the Amendment would save the Court from becoming blocked by an overwhelming rush of applications. The Home Secretary would exercise his discretion in a wise way, and feeling that to be the case he begged to move his Amendment.

*MR. CAVE said that they had in the Home Office machinery already set up and a staff already experienced in dealing with matters of this kind. He did not know whether hon. Members realised it, but he thought they would find on examination that the number of petitions to the Home Office against sentences and convictions in this country already exceeded 2,000 in every year. The Home Office dealt very rapidly and efficiently with those applications under rules laid down by the officials after long experience. The rules were set out in a well-known memorandum, and he thought that everybody who was acquainted with the procedure knew that it was satisfactory in its results. The Home Office did not content itself with merely considering the evidence at the trial. Of course, the Court of Criminal Appeal would be confined to the evidence at the trial, unless some new facts were brought forward; but the Home Office did not take that course. It made inquiries, and where new facts were suggested it made its own investigation into the facts. In that way the department often ascertained new facts that were not brought out at the trial. That was an elastic and an informal procedure, but it operated in many cases to the advantage of the person accused. Where new facts of that kind were found out by the Home Office—often by the police—they were brought to the notice of the Judge or the chairman who tried the case. The Judge or chairman, as the case might be, was asked to say whether if he had known those facts he would have been satisfied with the verdict or would have imposed the sentence which he had in fact passed on the prisoner; and after receiving and considering his reply the Home Office was able, in many cases, to remit the whole or a portion of the sentence imposed upon a prisoner, or to take some other steps such as the circumstances of the case appeared to warrant. The effect of the Amendment was that the same kind of procedure should in the first instance be followed under the Bill. It was proposed that the Home Office should first be appealed to. It should still have the power of dealing with an appeal summarily, but if it thought that there was a doubt about the verdict or the sentence it could give leave to go to the more formal tribunal—the Court of Criminal Appeal—where the matter could be thrashed out. The Amendment admitted the principle of the Bill, but suggested a machinery simpler, less expensive, and more to the advantage of the accused than the machinery suggested by the Bill. For those reasons he seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out the words 'Court of Criminal Appeal,' and insert the words 'Secretary of State.' "—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Court of Criminal Appeal' stand part of the Bill."

VISCOUNT TURNOUR said that this was really a very proper Amendment, under which the Home Secretary would be called upon to exercise powers of a far less responsible character than those he now exercised. He did not know that at this stage in the history of the present Parliament much good was done by taking the views of any member of His Majesty's Government, and comparing them with the views he expressed before taking office. He might point out, however, that the learned Attorney-General himself said in a previous debate on this subject that he doubted whether there was a case made out for the substitution of a tribunal consisting of three Judges for the machinery at present at the disposal of the Home Secretary, which had worked with entire satisfaction. He sympathised with the Home Secretary regarding the method which had been adopted by the Press of both Parties in attacking that machinery. He thought the Home Secretary had a very justifiable ground of complaint on that score; but the point he wished to emphasise was that by refusing to accept the Amendment the right hon. Gentleman was really yielding to that popular clamour. While he believed that the attacks which had been made on the Home Office had had some unfortunate effects, he did not think that they had really shaken confidence in the position of the Home Secretary and in the machinery at his disposal for dealing with these matters. It would be a great pity if the action of the Government should be interpreted as a confession of cowardice attributable to the very often unscrupulous methods used by the Press on both sides in attacking the Home Office. He would be glad to hear whether the views expressed by the Attorney-General before he came into office were not thought to be better than the views to which he had given utterance since. Nothing had occurred since 1898 to materially alter the views which were then so admirably expressed by the Attorney-General. It was because he believed that this Amendment would not put too great a burden upon the Home Secretary, but would act as a necessary drag on the wheel, and prevent too many applications for leave to appeal coming before the Court, that he supported the Amendment of his hon. and learned friend.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR said that he did not agree with the noble Lord in thinking that this was a very small matter. It was a very serious matter, and he, for one, objected strongly to erecting the Home Office into a Court of Law. The Home Office, as all knew who had served in Parliament, was at the present time overburdened with work. Not only had the Department as much work as it could do, but it had even more than it could do efficiently. Therefore, he thought the House of Commons should halt before it imposed any further serious obligations upon the Home Office. The present pressure upon the Department was one reason why he objected to turning it into a Court of Law to decide most important matters. His next reason for objecting to the Amendment was of a very different character. The prisoner was to be considered, and no matter how humane the Home Office or the Home Secretary might be, still the Department was always considered by the prisoner as his gaoler. Could there be anything more absurd than to suppose that the prisoner could appeal with confidence to his gaoler to decide in his favour on the question whether he should have an appeal or not? He had had some little experience of the feelings of a prisoner, and he submitted that it would not be a wise proceeding to throw this burden on the Home Office and to let it appear to the prisoner himself that he was dependent upon his gaoler for justice in a matter of that kind.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said the Amendment was really an alternative proposal to the Bill, because it suggested a different method altogether of dealing with the matter. He desired to remind the House that the Home Secretary retained under this Bill all the powers which at the present time he possessed. He had the right at any time to obtain the assistance of the Court of Appeal with a view to eliciting an answer which might be of some guidance to him in the discharge of his important functions. The Amendment proposed that there should be no appeal except at the instance of the Secretary of State, and destroyed altogether any direct right of appeal which was proposed under the Bill. He had had the experience, which many of them no doubt had had, of listening to speeches delivered some years ago in that House in reference to proposals bearing some resemblance to those under contemporary discussion. He congratulated the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone on the rewards which had attended his industry. He had exhumed out of the dreary catacombs of *Hansard* ancient and unsavoury deliverances which he (the Attorney-General) made nine years ago.

LORD R. CECIL: It was an excellent speech.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said he had stated that the Home Secretary discharged the functions of a Court of Appeal, and that there was at that time a feeling that that method of appeal was satisfactory and adequate. Considerable light, however, was thrown upon the machinery of the Home Office by the Beck case. The Commission reported that the machinery of the Home Office was quite inadequate to examine and decide upon the immense number of questions which were presented for every-day consideration. The alternatives were the reorganisation of the whole machinery of the Home Office so as to constitute it a Court of Appeal as well as a Government Department, or to create such a tribunal as that which that Bill proposed to set up. The conclusive objection to building upon the foundation of the Home Office was that the proceedings took place in secrecy. There was no representation of the accused. There was no argument, no evidence, no publicity. It was impossible, after the experience of the last two or three years in relation to cases which he did not need to mention, to say that any proposal to develop the machinery of the Home Office would have inspired the public confidence which he was convinced was necessary. He invited his hon. and learned friend to recognise that such a scheme would have no chance, even if it were perfected so as to meet the views of the Committee which sat on the Beck case, of being accepted. A tribunal which sat publicly, heard all that was to be said, and gave a judgment founded on reasons and argument would satisfy everybody that all had been done that could be done to get to the bottom of the case and would be infinitely more satisfactory than the Home Office ever could be.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON contended that there was no direct right of appeal given under the Bill. The prisoner must obtain leave to appeal. The Amendment merely substituted the Home Office for the Court of Appeal. In spite of all the Attorney-General had said they had the evidence of a great number of years during which the Home Office had worked in this question of appeal to the satisfactorion of all parties. The Home Office, as those who had any experience of its dealings with criminal matters knew, was prompt. Its methods of inquiry were convenient, because they were not bound by strict rule and precedent, and, what was rather important, there were no costs to stimulate the small practitioner. They had heard that night, and more on the Second Reading, one great argument for appeal being assigned to the Court and taken away from the Home Office, namely, the relief to the Home Secretary's feelings, which were very much pained and lacerated by the comments of the Press in recent cases.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): My feelings were not lacerated.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that unless he misunderstood the Home Secretary's remarks on the subject of the use of the Royal prerogative, the right hon. Gentlemen felt very much the action of the Press.

*MR. GLADSTONE: What I said was that if a man took the office of Home Secretary he must take what he gets. I did use the word "intolerable," and I adhere to it, because my opinion was, and is, that the fact that the Home Office cannot reply makes the position intolerable from the point of view of the administration of justice. That has nothing to do with my own personal feelings. I think I can stand the racket.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he did not suggest that the right hon. Member was less able to stand the attacks of the Press or the criticisms of the public than other people. Other Departments of the Government had had some experience of these attacks. The present and the late President of the Board of Education had suffered attack from the Press.

*MR. GLADSTONE: They can answer.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Amendment put the Home Office in the position of preparing a case for the Court of Criminal Appeal. It would be a great advantage to that Court if the matters coming before it were put into shape, if the Home Office decided whether the matter was worthy of the attention of the Court of Appeal. The Home Office was as capable as the Court would be to determine whether or no a *prima facie* case had been made out for appeal. Acceptance of the Amendment would mean not only that there would be a limit, and a reasonable limit, put upon the number of these appeals, but that there would be a very great economy of the time of the Court. The learned Member for Reading said the matter would be settled by a few words addressed to the Court by counsel. He could hardly have read the procedure contemplated by the Bill or pictured what would happen. The prisoner would not be there, counsel would not be there. What would happen would be that the depositions, the Judge's notes, and the like would be laid before the Court. The Court would have to wade through these and determine the question one way or the other. The Amendment proposed that instead the Home Office should decide whether or not a *prima facie* case existed.

*MR. GLADSTONE said he would like to point out that the Amendment really imposed new duties and new functions upon the Home Office. At present the Home Office action was based on the prerogative of mercy. Now it was proposed by the hon. Baronet that the Home Office should prepare cases for the Court of Appeal. Indeed if the Amendment were adopted the Home Office would be changed into a Court of Appeal of first instance. The duties of the Home Secretary and the Home Office would be seriously and dangerously widened. At present, the Home Secretary in certain cases examined into the question whether or not a man had been rightly convicted and decided to the best of his ability. The Amendment made the Home Office responsible in all criminal cases of appeal for ascertaining whether a *prima facie* case had been made out. For his own part he protested against these new constitutional duties being imposed upon the Home Office. There was another question. Supposing the Amendment were accepted and the Home Secretary had practically to advise the Court of Appeal as to whether a *prima facie* case had been made out for appeal, and supposing he refused an application and was asked in that House to state why he had refused, was he to state his case? It seemed to him it would be extremely difficult to refuse. It was not like the decisions which he now had to make when he necessarily refused to give his reasons because he could not disclose the information at his disposal. When it was a matter of deciding whether or no there was a *prima facie* case for appeal he did not see how he could refuse his reasons. If he were to state his reasons there were evident disadvantages. He hoped the House would not accept the Amendment.

MR. LYTTELTON said he did not share the view that the Home Secretary had presented on the matter. The Amendment of his hon. and learned friend was almost the most important Amendment to the Bill and was well worthy of the attention of the House, if only for the reason that the Judges had unanimously recommended the proposal some years ago. His view of the Amendment was that it would provide that the Home Secretary, when cases of importance were brought before him, should have an opportunity for taking action. There were cases where it was desirable, not merely in the interests of justice, but also to allay dissatisfaction, that he should have the opportunity of bringing the case to the Court of Criminal Appeal. He thought the Amendment of his hon. and learned friend gave the Home Secretary that opportunity. He was afraid he disagreed with the hon. Member for Cambridge University. He did not think it meant that there should devolve on the Home Secretary the duty of finding out whether there was a *prima facie* case for appeal. In ninety-nine cases out of 100, the Home Secretary and his staff were competent to deal with the question. There might be exceptional cases where the Home Secretary and his staff thought they were of such gravity and perplexity, and where the public took so much interest, that they would wish the proceedings to be public. The Amendment gave them the necessary power to ensure that. That was his reading of the Amendment. He confessed he would like to hear a reconsidered opinion from that which the Attorney-General gave. He would not read it as it was given nine years ago, but it was immensely forcible. The Attorney-General then said that he had actually known a case of murder tried at Leeds where a verdict of guilty was given, and was strongly supported by the Judge, and he imagined it would be strongly supported by any Court of Appeal. The Home Secretary sent a Commissioner to Leeds who discovered by methods outside the law that the case was a genuine one, and a free pardon was given. He would like to know how the Attorney-General now regarded the argument which he then brought forward in favour of the Home Office as against a Court of Appeal.

SIR JOHN WALTON said he made special provision for the Court of Appeal to deal with special cases by sending down Commissioners to take the evidence and to report on the evidence to the Court.

MR. LYTTELTON said he was extremely surprised to hear what the Attorney-General had said. He took his word for it that provision had been made in the Bill for evidence to be taken in the way which the Home Office now took it, but what the Attorney-General now said negatived that altogether.

SIR JOHN WALTON said they took the depositions.

MR. LYTTELTON said the Attorney-General knew that he was arguing for the possibility of an informal inquiry, and he led the House to believe some moments previously that such powers were contained in that Bill. That was entirely wrong. No such powers were contained in the Bill. He challenged the Attorney-General to contradict him. Would the Commissioner who was to make an inquiry under that Bill be entitled to go outside the ordinary rules of evidence? He thought not. He thought the Attorney-General would agree, and therefore his interruption was entirely unfounded. His argument was that justice was more likely to be attained by an informal inquiry by the Home Office going outside the legal rules of evidence. If he was right then he was afraid that in the case the Attorney-General argued nine years ago the man would have been hanged.

MR. S. T. EVANS thought the right hon. Gentleman had entirely mistaken the scope of the Amendment. It did not raise the question whether or not the functions of the Home Office should be extended, but merely the question of giving a man's right to appeal to the Court of Appeal. The Amendment simply said that if they wanted leave to appeal they must not go to the Court of Appeal. Under the Bill no power which the Home Secretary now had was taken away from him. All the functions the Home Secretary now had would still remain to him. If the Bill altered those functions at all, it was to extend his present powers. It was not a question whether Judges had recommended this or that, that they had to consider. They were not dealing with the matter as lawyers. He had often said, and he said again, that when they were dealing with questions of legal reform Judges were not the persons as to whose views they ought to inquire. Instances in support of that view could be quoted without number. Fifty or sixty years ago all the Judges in a body declined to allow reform of the law in order to allow prisoners' counsel, in cases of felony, to address the jury, and one of the Judges went so far as to say that if that law was passed he would resign. The law was passed, but he did not resign. It was entirely wrong in dealing with legal matters to ask what the Judges thought should be done.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby), regretted that on the present occasion he found himself out of sympathy with his hon. friends. All the Home Secretary's rights were to be left alone exactly as at present. The Home Office was going to hold the same inquiries, to take the same informal evidence, and to do the same amount of justice in the future as in the past; but there were cases such as the Beck case where the Home Office would have refused leave to appeal, and it was that case and one or two others of the same kind which had awakened the public conscience on the question, had caused the Bill to be brought forward, and had caused the Attorney-General to change his mind with such effect. An illustration of what would happen in such cases would suffice to show that the Amendment ought not to be adopted. If it was adopted and a prisoner applied to the Home Office for leave to appeal, the Home Office would make an inquiry taking three or four months. If the man were innocent there was no sense in keeping him waiting for two or three months to know whether he had a right to appeal. The practice the Bill proposed to set up was that the prisoner by means of notes or through his counsel should ask the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal. The permission should be granted or refused in the course of a very few minutes. If counsel got up and attempted to put a case and had no proper evidence that there was any such right to appeal he would be stopped. He ventured to say, that, as in cases at present, where leave to appeal was refused, it would be impossible for counsel of respectability to prolong his application before the Court if he had no case. It was only in cases where there was a real right to appeal that counsel would insist on his right that any length of time should be consumed. If a prisoner was to have the right to appeal he should have the right to go to the Court and ask for it without losing his liberty. That permission to appeal should rest with the Home Secretary was absurd. He felt that he was obliged to vote against the Amendment.

MR. RAWLINSON, in reply to the various points that had been raised, said objection had been taken to reference being made to the Report of the Commission on the Beck case and to the Reports of the Judges in 1892 and 1895 on the ground that the Judges took a conservative view. Whom were they to go to? Were they to go to the people who had administered the law on a question of machinery like this? He ventured to intervene because the Home Secretary seemed to misunderstand the purport of the Amendment. They did not propose to alter the functions of the Home Secretary in any way. At the present time anyone who was dissatisfied with his conviction sent his application to the Home Secretary, and if the Amendment were passed the Bill would permit him to do exactly the same as he did now. In any case where there arose a point of law or of fact, or mixed points of law and fact, then the Home Secretary would give leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal. Many people shared the feeling that a Court composed of three Judges was not a good tribunal to deal with cases in which application was made for leave to appeal—cases in which documents and copies of evidence were sent before the Court. The Home Office, it was believed, would do the work much better than the tribunal proposed, and wherever necessary there would not be the slightest difficulty in referring cases to the Court of Criminal Appeal.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 151; Noes, 52. (Division List No. 340.)

AYES.

Aignew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Herbert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner, F.J.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'll
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil G. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Chalres Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leciester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil Milliam
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J.W.H (Somerset, E
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Laeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bertram, Julius
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R
Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Remnant, James Farquharson)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff's)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Rawlinson and Mr. Cave.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY moved, to add the words, 'Provided that any person convicted on indictment upon a charge involving sentence of death shall be entitled to appeal under this Act to the Court of Criminal Appeal against his conviction, on any ground of appeal which involves a question of law alone, or a question of fact alone, or a question of mixed law and fact.'" He believed that to submit any Amendment to the House under the circumstances then obtaining was a work of some futility, as one had to contend against, not only the unsuitability of the hour, but the despotism of the Treasury Bench, which seemed to regard every line of the Bill as sacrosanct. Adopting the common form used in regard to most of the Amendments, he ventured to submit that this was at least one of the most important Amendments that the House was called upon to consider. The Bill as it stood gave an absolute right of appeal upon any question of law, and it gave a right of appeal on questions of fact, or mixed questions of law and fact, by leave of the Court of Criminal Appeal. His Amendment proposed that in the case of any person convicted upon a charge involving a sentence of death that person should be entitled as of right without the necessity of going through any technical forms or applications to an appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal. His submission was that given a Court of Criminal Appeal it was almost unarguable that they should shut out from that Court by any technical barrier a person sentenced to death. The noble and learned Lord the Member for East Marylebone had said earlier in the debate that he entertained no unlimited admiration of trial by jury. Whatever the noble Lord might think about trial by jury, he (Mr. Bottomley) certainly did not entertain any unlimited admiration for the present judicial bench. He had heard a Judge who was at present on the bench, when dealing with a trial for murder, dwell during the greater part of his summing up upon the moral delinquencies of the prisoner and a lady who was not his wife. Everyone had heard or seen cases in recent times where Judges did not give satisfaction to the general public by their method of administering the criminal law. A man under sentence of death would have no point of law to appeal upon, because it was very rarely indeed that a point of law arose in a murder case. Every schoolboy knew the distinction between manslaughter and murder. A person under sentence of death scarcely ever had a right of appeal on a point of law, although on almost every ground that could be named that right should undoubtedly be his. Even if he could have claimed an unlimited admiration for the judicial bench, which, as he had said, he could not, he would still have been unable to claim unlimited admiration for the wisdom of modern counsel. He had seen many a man's case lost in Court by the inability, sometimes the inexperience, sometimes the indiscretion, of the learned counsel to whom it had been committed. He had seen counsel who had done their best, but had very often put the case in a light which could have only one result, namely, to obtain the conviction of the prisoner. Considering all these things, he put it to the House very earnestly that in a Court of Criminal Appeal they ought to give a person who was under the death penalty the right of appeal without any restriction. When he raised the point in Committee the Attorney-General dismissed it on the ground that there was no logic behind it. That would apply to many provisions in the Bill. On the question of logic they might even object to providing, on questions of law, that the members of the Court should give their judgments separately, which would interest lawyers only, while, on questions of fact, the one judgment alone was given. He desired to put this further consideration. In the matter of the death penalty many of them entertained a very strong view indeed as to the serious and solemn character of the jurisdiction of the State. So long as we had capital punishment as part of our penal code we had no right to deprive any person under sentence of death of every opportunity under the law to establish his innocence. He summarised his argument thus, that the attitude of the Judge sometimes, the conduct of counsel frequently, the atmosphere of the case at times, led to convictions where a man was innocent. The solemnity of the matter was quite sufficient to recommend it to the conscience of the country. He had had many opportunities of discussing the matter with Members of all shades of political opinion, and in no case had there been any serious exception taken to the proposal. The only reply, namely, that it might mean delay and expense in murder trials, he declined even to consider in dealing with a question of such solemn magnitude.

LORD R. CECIL seconded. The Amendment in his view was very desirable.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 8, at end, to add: 'Provided that any person convicted on indictment upon a charge involving sentence of death shall be entitled to appeal under this Act to the Court of Criminal Appeal against his conviction on any ground of appeal which involves a question of law alone or a question of fact alone or a question of mixed law and fact.' "—(*Mr. Bottomley*).

SIR JOHN WALTON said the Government were prepared to accept the Amendment.

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted in the Bill," put, and carried.

Agreed to.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) moved to leave out the words directing the Court of Criminal Appeal to allow appeal if they think the verdict of the jury should be set aside on any ground on which a verdict of a jury may be set aside in an appeal to the Court of Appeal in civil proceedings, his object being to substitute words directing the Court to allow the appeal if they think the verdict is, under all the circumstances of the case, unsafe or unsatisfactory. The Amendment, he said, was one which had some relation to the Amendment moved by the Member for Cambridge University which the House had rejected. That was an Amendment which would have excluded from the operation of the Bill the right of appealing on issues of fact. In his opinion the House rightly rejected that, but he wished it to be made quite clear how far the right of appeal which was proposed by the Bill was of any value. The question was extremely difficult for laymen to understand. As it stood at present the clause which dealt with the matter allowed an appeal on any ground on which the verdict of the jury might be set aside in a civil case. But the permissible range of appeal in civil cases was very narrowly circumscribed. There was the case, well known in the profession, of the Metropolitan Railway Company against Wright. Let him remind the House of the issue in that case. The issue, in a nutshell, was whether, when the Court of Appeal was of opinion that the verdict of the jury in the Court below was wrong, that it was such a verdict as they would not have arrived at, they had a right to interfere. On the one side it was contended that it was the duty of the appellate tribunal in such a case to interfere, on the other that, before the Court of Appeal interfered, they must be satisfied that the verdict was such as no twelve reasonable men would ever have come to. These were the two contentions, each of which was strenuously insisted upon in the House of Lords. The second carried the day. He would read the House what was said by some of their Lordships on the matter. Lord Selborne said that there must be such overwhelming preponderance of evidence as to make the verdict so unreasonable as to be perverse, such a verdict as no jury, instructed and assisted properly by the Judge, could return. Lord Herschell said that a verdict ought not to be disturbed unless it was one which no jury reviewing the whole of the evidence reasonably could with propriety find. Lord Halsbury went further. He said that if a reasonable man might find the verdict which had been found, no Court had jurisdiction to disturb the decision on fact which law had confided to juries. He asked the House to consider what was involved in that. At once it became clear that if the practice in civil matters were imported into criminal matters, they had very small security indeed that those injustices in criminal matters which had so much exercised the minds of the people in the last twelve months would be dealt with at all under the new Bill. Let him take as an instance the Edalji case. He was not going to argue that case for a moment, but he would remind the House what the Committee on it said—that owing to the circumstances they thought the conviction was "unsafe and unsatisfactory." They said it was a conviction which ought not to stand, and it had been altered with the consent of all parties. The point was that under the Bill the decision in the Edalji case would not have been altered. Unsafe, no doubt, conceded to be unsatisfactory, but no one would say it was a verdict which a reasonable man could not have found. The Home Secretary could not say so, because he reminded the House only the other night of the character and description of the jury and of its competence. A reasonable jury could have found the verdict in that case and did find it. It was merely because on review it appeared to be unsafe and unsatisfactory that it was dealt with. If this Amendment was not passed it was just those cases which required it most that would not receive the benefit of the Bill. All his Amendment did was to adopt the words of the Committee in the Edalji case, to adopt their finding that the verdict of the jury was unsafe and unsatisfactory, and to apply that principle to the Bill, instead of saying that an appeal should be allowed only in such cases as would enable a civil appellate Court to reverse the decision. Wherever the verdict of the jury appeared to be unsafe or unsatisfactory it was perfectly intelligible, and the appellate tribunal should be enabled to deal with such cases on appeal. If the Amendment was accepted the House would have what it believed it was getting and what the country desired, namely, a really effective appeal on matters of fact where there had been a miscarriage of justice in the Court below.

MR. ASTBURY (Lancashire, Southport), in seconding, said that this was the first Amendment which did not seek in some way to destroy the value of the Bill, so far as it dealt with appeals on questions of fact. He was strongly in favour of an effective appeal on questions of fact. With regard to the reason of the Amendment he thought the whole clause must be looked at, because it might be said in connection with the second part of the clause that it to some extent at all events, if not entirely, would provide what his learned friend wished to bring about. He did not think that was really so on any grounds on which the verdict of the jury could be set aside. He was not quite sure that he understood the draughtsmanship of the clause, or that he knew what the draughtsman meant when he referred to a wrong decision of fact. There could not be a wrong decision of fact in a criminal case unless it was made by the jury. Those Members of the House not thoroughly acquainted with the technicalities of the question ought to understand that the present position was that appeals on questions of fact in criminal cases were to rest on the same rules as in civil cases. They might have a question of fact in civil cases decided by a jury or by a Judge. If it were decided by a Judge an appeal would lie from his decision, and if the Court of Appeal was dissatisfied with that decision, it had full power to reverse it, and frequently did so. But on questions of fact tried by a jury in criminal cases the House of Lords had in recent years laid down a purely artificial rule that unless the verdict of the jury was such that a reasonable man could not have arrived at it, they would not consider it. If there was any evidence on which a reasonable man could possibly find that verdict that settled the matter. The effect of that was that if they had a jury in a civil case they were practically unable to appeal at all from an unsatisfactory decision, unless they were able to move for a new trial. This was not a case of moving for a new trial. The verdict of the jury could only be set aside altogether if it was a perverse finding, or in the case of new trials where there had been misdirection or something of that kind. Those who wanted appeals on questions of fact in criminal cases wanted those appeals apart altogether from misdirection, and his view was that the words of the clause as drawn would prevent the Bill being successful in most of the cases where there had been a desire for the Bill. The words read, "The Court of Appeal shall allow the appeal if they think that the verdict of the jury can be set aside on any ground on which the verdict of a jury may be set aside in an appeal in civil proceedings, or on the ground of a wrong decision of any question of law or fact, or of mixed law and fact." That was the only case which would be dealt with. He was afraid that if the first part of the section remained as it was the Court would interpret a wrong decision of fact in the second part of the section as a decision which they could upset on appeal, and in order to upset it on appeal it would have to be a decision such as they could upset in a civil case. If the Attorney-General and the Government were anxious that there should be a really effective Court of Criminal Appeal which would not be bound by hard and fast lines, and if they wished that the appeal on questions of fact should be an effective appeal such as would allay the feelings of anxiety in the country which had given rise to the Bill, he hoped the Attorney-General would insert some such words as those that had been suggested. The words could not possibly do any harm; all that they said was that a verdict of a jury which was unsafe or unsatisfactory might be set aside. If that was not a case where an appeal should be allowed he did not know what was.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 11, to leave out from the word 'jury,' to the word 'or,' in line 13, and insert the words 'is under all the circumstances of the case unsafe or unsatisfactory.'"—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*SIR JOHN WALTON said he felt some sympathy for the anxiety displayed by his hon. and learned friends that the Court of Appeal should not be fettered by rigid rules; and that in considering whether a conviction should be sustained or quashed it should have a wide discretion; but, on the other hand, it was important to remember that under our Constitution the tribunal for deciding the question of fact was the jury. There had been a rule for adjusting the relations between the Court of Appeal and the jury in civil procedure which had the immense advantage of being formed on scientific precision. They understood what that rule was, but the Amendment erred in the direction of being loose to the point of obscurity and of being unscientific. He would be very glad to accept words which would have the advantage of some scientific precision and avoid the dangers attached to the words suggested. He asked the House to consider the rule which applied to civil cases and which he thought should apply to cases of the kind under discussion. The Court of Appeal had to recognise that it was dealing with a tribunal specially competent to deal with the question of fact, and if the issue had been clearly and fairly put before the jury, if they had understood it, if they had applied their minds to it, and if they were not influenced by misdirection or bias, then the Court of Appeal might say, "We should have come to a different conclusion, but we cannot disturb the finding of the judges of fact." The rule which would be applied if the Bill stood as drawn would be this. If the Court of Appeal thought that reasonable men properly instructed could not have arrived at the verdict at which the jury had arrived then they might set it aside, but only then. His hon. and learned friend suggested the insertion of the words "unsafe and unsatisfactory." He did not know what meaning they should attach to the words. He believed that if they were inserted it would afterwards be held that "unsafe" must be used in connection with some canon of safety, as, for instance, danger to public safety under the conditions in which the law was being administered. The word "unsatisfactory" was equally open to doubt, because it might be said, he thought it would be said, that an unsatisfactory verdict meant a verdict to which the existing standard of the House of Lords was applied and which showed that the verdict did not conform to that standard. He was very anxious that the matter should not be left obscure, and if his hon. and learned friend was prepared to accept the clause as it then stood he would take care that in another place the matter should be considered fully, and if words which were more satisfactory could be framed they should be framed. In answer to his hon. and learned friend behind him he wished to point out that there were questions of fact which the Court had to determine before the evidence became admissible. They might also get judgment of facts.

MR. F. E. SMITH said if he rightly understood the Attorney-General he gathered that he did not dissent from his view, but that he objected to the wide meaning of the words he had suggested and of the manner in which they might be interpreted. He would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said that he objected to the withdrawal of the Amendment, because he wished to raise the question as to whether that was not a time when it would be desirable to adjourn the debate. He did not think anyone could say that the discussion had been in any sense of a Party or obstructive character. If the division lists were looked into he believed it would be found in every case that there had been a real division of opinion and not merely a Party division. It was not desirable in the small hours of the morning to go into the details of an important Bill like that, especially when they realised, as they must do after the instance they had just had, that there were many points which had still to be adjusted. He thought on every ground that it was undesirable for a Bill of the character and importance of this one to be discussed in the way it must be if the Government were determined to complete the Report stage at that sitting. He therefore moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. George Whiteley, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said that he did not think the hon. Member knew exactly the circumstances of the case. The House, perhaps, would take it from him that the Government intended to put the Bill down on Friday last. The hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University saw him, however, and represented that it was a Bill in which the lawyers who were Members of the House took a very great interest. He said that it was not possible for them to attend in any large number on Friday last, and he, himself, having a large number of Amendments down on the Paper could not be there to undertake the duty of moving them. He told the hon. and learned Member that it would be impossible to put down the Bill at any other time than at eleven o'clock at night, and he understood from him that when it was put down the discussion would not be of a highly critical or controversial nature, and that it would take only about two hours to finish the whole of the proceedings on the Bill. The hon. and learned Member would no doubt substantiate that statement. He believed he (Mr. Whiteley) said nearly the same thing to the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of Oxford. He told him that the Bill could only be taken at eleven o'clock at night and that the Government preferred to keep to Friday, although they were prepared in order to meet the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite to take it at eleven o'clock. He appealed to hon. Members whether, under the circumstances which he had narrated, it was quite fair to ask for the adjournment of the debate. The Government had gone out of their way to oblige hon. Members opposite, and he himself had had to overcome some great difficulties, as it had been necessary to rearrange practically the whole of the business in order to meet the wishes of the Opposition.

Lord R. CECIL said he was quite unaware of any of the circumstances to which the Patronage Secretary had alluded. He thought that the hon. Gentleman had overlooked one aspect of the case that ought to be considered, that was whether it was really possible under present conditions to discuss effectively the very important Amendments to the Bill which still remained on the Paper. As the House knew, he was strongly in favour of the Bill, but he thought it was a measure which required most careful consideration, as it made a colossal change in our criminal law system—a change which he thought a very proper one. Though the Bill was discussed in Committee upstairs, he must say that the discussion was not a very thorough one. There did not happen to be any very strong opponents of the Bill present except the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge, with the result that the discussion was on friendly lines. It was eminently a Bill that ought to be discussed by the House at large. Though there had been a great number of different opinions expressed on each of the questions that had been raised, he did not think anyone would say that the discussion that night had not been perfectly legitimate and also useful, and that it had not been directed entirely to improving the Bill. He hoped that they would not be forced to discuss the Bill until five or six o'clock in the morning, as that would be an unfortunate result. With reference to what was done last Friday, might he point out that if the Bill had been set down on that day it would have come on at four or five o'clock in the afternoon? That would not have been the disadvantage to the legal profession that was contemplated by his hon. and learned friend. But if the present Bill had come on at five o'clock the result would have been that the Government would not have been able to get their Butter Bill through, and then they would have been obliged to take it at eleven o'clock at night instead of this Bill. The fact was that it was owing to the backward state of business that the Government were compelled to take important Bills at eleven o'clock at night. It was very unfortunate, and he thought that the Government should show the House some mercy. He earnestly hoped that the Government would consent to the adjournment of the debate and would not insist on the Bill being further discussed at that juncture.

Mr. RAWLINSON said that the Patronage Secretary had rather appealed to him, and he took that opportunity of thanking the hon. Gentleman for the way in which up to the present he had met him in connection with the Bill. The measure came on unexpectedly for Second Reading, and after it had been discussed for a short time the debate was adjourned. The next time the Bill came on the day was a Friday, and the Second Reading took place at a time when practically no legal Gentlemen interested in the question could be there. The measure then went to a Committee upstairs, and he was sure the Attorney-General would bear him out when he said that the discussion was conducted in a most friendly way. The Committee only took two days over the Bill, and he himself never pressed for a division on any of his Amendments, but always said that the big points of principle would have to be discussed in the House. On the last day he made a request to the Attorney-General in open Committee that the Bill on the Report Stage should not be put down on a Friday. The Attorney-General said that it was a very reasonable suggestion, and after the way in which the business had been got through before the Committee he would see that the request was granted. He was sure that the Attorney-General and the Patronage Secretary had no means of helping it, but the Bill did come on rather late upon a Friday—about a quarter past three—and the debate was adjourned in the ordinary way at five o'clock. After that the Patronage Secretary, who was exceedingly kind, asked whether it would be more convenient that the Bill should come on again upon the next Friday or at eleven o'clock at night. He (Mr. Rawlinson) replied that if he was given the choice of two evils he would rather have the Bill taken at eleven o'clock at night, but he did not think he was sufficiently an optimist to estimate that two hours would suffice for the discussion, but on the contrary he was under the impression that he put it at about three hours.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that as the Patronage Secretary had appealed to him, he would intervene just for one moment. He thought the hon. Gentleman had forgotten the circumstances under which he spoke to him (Sir William Anson) on the subject. What he said had no reference to a sitting after eleven o'clock at night. The Patronage Secretary came to him on the afternoon of last Friday week, after he had made a protest against the Bill being taken when legal Members of the House could not attend. The Patronage Secretary told him the difficulty there was in arranging to take the Bill at any other time and made a suggestion that some portion of time should be taken from the Committee Stage of the Evicted Tenants Bill and given to this measure, if arrangements on those lines could be come to. He had replied that this would not be an acceptable arrangement to his friends, and, as the House knew, that was not done.

*Mr. CAVE thought the Motion for the adjournment of the debate ought to be supported, not on the ground of the convenience of Members—and least of all of those who sat on the Opposition side—but entirely on a consideration of the question as to whether it was right or fair to a Bill of that importance that it should be discussed at that hour of the night. If they took one of the speeches they had just listened to, it was quite clear that the hon. and learned Member had not made up his mind whether the Amendment under discussion should be accepted or not. He did not think such matters ought to be considered in the small hours of the morning and after three and a half hours of a very serious and earnest debate on the merits of the Bill. It was only right that they should have another opportunity of discussing the Amendment, and if the debate were adjourned he did not think it would be necessary to devote more than two hours more to it on some future night after eleven o'clock. He himself told the Patronage Secretary that he thought the debate would take about five hours, and he held that that estimate would be much more likely to be realised if they adjourned the debate at that juncture than it would be if they continued till the end of the Bill was reached. The Motion was really a fair one, because it could not be denied that the House ought to have an opportunity of discussing the rest of the Bill at a reasonable hour.

Question put.

The House divided: — Ayes, 57; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 341.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bertram, Julus
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool,Walton
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Laurence Hardy and Mr. Hills.

NOES.

Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt.HnRichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clough, William
Collins, SirWm.J.(SPancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Duncan, C.Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorEMartin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes

Lyell, Charles Henry
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson,W. H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh,Central
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H(Somerset,E.
Toulmin, George
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question again proposed.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RAWLINSON moved an Amendment to give power to the Court of Appeal "to order a new trial at such time and place as they see fit to direct." Under the Bill as it stood he contended there was no power given to the Court of Appeal to order a new trial. They must convict or acquit. He ventured to submit that the power to order a new trial should reside in the Court. He would give one or two instances. There was the case where new facts came to the knowledge of the tribunal after the conviction of the prisoner; where, when a man was tried and convicted on evidence, and after his conviction other evidence was forthcoming on such a question as a defence of an *alibi* or something of that sort. At the present time the tribunal that was to determine the matter was a tribunal of three Judges in London. The case perhaps occurred in Northumberland, Wales, or Cornwall. That, he submitted, was unconstitutional and entirely wrong. In such circumstances the Court ought to have power to order a new trial so that the jury might decide on the value of the fresh evidence. For the first time under this Bill it was sought to take away the power of trying a case in this way by jury. By Sub-clause 4 of Clause 5, in certain cases, if the Court thought fit, though they found a man guilty on the evidence, they could if they thought he was insane at the time the act was committed, order him to be locked up during His Majesty's pleasure. It was most monstrous that the Court without the verdict of a jury should have power to find on their own initiative that a man who had been charged with an offence was insane at the time. If the Court came to the conclusion that the man might be mad they ought to have power to try by a fresh jury to determine the question whether he was mad. There were other more complex points raised in the same sub-section. It was as follows—

> "Where an appellant has been convicted of an offence and the jury could on the indictment have found him guilty of some other offence and on the finding of the jury it appears to the Court of Criminal Appeal that the jury must have been satisfied of facts which proved him guilty of that other offence, the Court may, instead of allowing or dismissing the appeal, substitute for the verdict found by the jury a verdict of guilty of that other offence and pass such sentence in substitution for the sentence passed at the trial as they think proper."

That was a most monstrous proposition. Let him give a concrete example. A man was charged with murder. The jury convicted him of manslaughter. The case came before the Court of Appeal. That Court must necessarily, and from the finding of the jury probably would, come to the conclusion that he had been guilty, that the man should have been convicted of the crime of murder. If they followed the provisions of the Bill it would be their duty to convict him on the evidence. There were other cases of a less extreme character in which the Court had power to convict of some other offence of which by the finding of the jury they gathered the prisoner must have been found guilty. It was unnecessary to indicate more fully his reasons. His Amendment simply gave power to the Court to order a new trial. There was one other point. Throughout the Bill the idea had been to assimilate, as far as practicable, appeals in criminal cases to those in civil cases. It was impossible to imagine an appeal in a civil case in which a new trial could not be got. In the case of a verdict being unsatisfactory the Court of Appeal would, of course, order that a fresh jury should try the case and the case would be re-tried. The analogy had been pressed far too strongly between civil and criminal cases. There was a wide distinction in practice, but to that extent he thought powers should be assimilated in criminal cases and civil.

MR. CLAVELL SALTER, in seconding, said the Amendment was regarded with great interest, and he thought with great approval by a considerable number of people outside that House who were much interested in the Bill. It was a proposal to allow the Court of Criminal Appeal to exercise what we, in this country, understood to be the essential function of a Court of Appeal dealing with the verdict of a jury. He did not think perhaps hon. Members who were not lawyers quite realised how novel was the function they were proposing to entrust to the new Court of Criminal Appeal. The ordinary function of a Court of Appeal was the function of a Court which was not charged with ascertaining the truth of the matter which came before it, but which had to inquire whether a Court below it had gone wrong; an entirely different function. That Court for the first time (in dealing with the verdict of the jury) had not merely to say if the Court below had gone wrong, but had to proceed on its own responsibility to deal with the case. The proposal was that in a proper case, but only in a proper case, the Court of Criminal Appeal should be allowed to exercise the ordinary functions of the Court of Appeal. It seemed to him to be only reasonable. He supported the Amendment on the ground of convenience and of expense. He did not think the bulk of hon. Members, who strongly, and perhaps rightly, supported the Bill, who were not versed in the law, had realised for one moment how great was the amount of inconvenience and expense in which, unless the Bill was amended, they were involving the country. He thought hon. Members would agree with him that the Bill would involve the constant re-trial of a large amount of ordinary criminal work. It was an unthinkable thing that any Court of Appeal would reverse the verdict of a jury, and set at liberty a man whom the jury had convicted, without seeing the witnesses. Therefore, the practical question before the House was: Should this re-trial of all ordinary criminal business, which would be a constant feature of our law, take place always in London, or, for the most part, in the localities in which the crime, or alleged crime, was committed. Hon. Members had the Beck case and the Edalji case in their minds, and they had got the impression that the new Court was going to be mainly, if not entirely, occupied in trying cases of great interest, and great public importance. Nothing could be further from the truth. There was no relation between difficulty and importance in legal matters. The cases which came before this Court would not be the important cases, but the difficult cases, and the great bulk of them would be the ordinary run of ordinary criminal work. He hoped the House would not be wearied if he illustrated what he meant, though one tried with some difficulty to deal with matters of that kind at that hour. He would ask hon. Members to follow him for a moment in considering a typical case such as would form the work which the new Court would be called on to do. A man had been convicted at quarter sessions in Northumberland of having stolen three hens. The evidence was not conclusive. The man was seen in the neighbourhood, some feathers were found in his coat pocket, there was some blood on his trousers, he made a damaging admission to a farmer's wife who was a neighbour, and there was certain other evidence of a circumstantial character. At the quarter sessions the man called three or four persons to give evidence as to his presence some considerable distance away. That kind of case would have taken a well-meaning bench and jury a day to try, and it would have involved the attendance away from their business of from twenty to twenty-five people of all kinds and degrees. The jury had convicted the man and the Court of Appeal had sufficient doubt to give leave to appeal. The question he wanted to put now to hon. Members of the House in all good faith was, did the Attorney-General or did anybody think that the score of witnesses and the counsel should go before the Judges in London? Where was the need for it? Where was the occasion to take all these unhappy people to London? There would be the local surveyor who had made the plans, the local doctor who had examined the blood-stains, the person who had discovered the feathers in the pocket of the coat, the farmer's wife to whom the damaging admission was made, to say nothing of the unfortunate witnesses for the alibi. He ventured to say that it was approaching an absurdity to suggest that all these people were to be brought up to London at a heavy cost. Was it not more reasonable to give the Court of Appeal the power to say, if they had any doubt about that verdict, that the case had better be re-tried at the next assizes in Northumberland? One of the great objects of the Bill was said to be to satisfy public opinion, and he would urge on hon. Members that cases in which public opinion was excited throughout the land in regard to a criminal trial were exceedingly rare. The feeling was often purely local, and any public opinion which had been excited in Northumberland over the case he had mentioned would be far better satisfied and set at rest by a local trial on the spot, than by calling all these people to London, where the local papers could not come, and in regard to which the people interested would have to depend on what the witnesses told them. He ventured to urge the matter not only on the grounds of convenience and expense, but on behalf of the witnesses who, would be put to considerable trouble. Hon. Members did not realise what a large interest was concerned. He urged it also in the interests of the convicted man, because there was no doubt that if the Court of Appeal in London was compelled to have people up from the ends of the earth, they would be very chary of doing so. They would be much more likely to listen favourably if they had the power to order a local re-trial. If the sessions were far away, if the case was near London, or if it was a matter in which there was great public interest, it could be heard in London. Such cases were small in number and nine-tenths or ninety-nine-hundredths of the work could be done in the manner he had suggested. If they did that they would be seeking the best way to satisfy public opinion, and would be greatly adding to the effectiveness of the machinery they were creating.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 25, after the word 'entered,' to insert the words 'or may order a new trial at such time and place as they see fit to direct.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*SIR JOHN WALTON said his hon. friend was quite right in describing the Amendment as serious, and he wished to explain the reasons in consequence of which he could not accept it. He thought it would be a very great misfortune if they were to vary the provisions of the Bill as they now stood. Broadly, he might say that the new Court of Appeal was only asked to do what the Home Office had been doing for years, namely:—to see whether convictions were to be maintained or to be set aside. It was in his opinion most desirable that the State should not be put to the cost, that the witnesses should not be subject to the trouble and the prisoner to the ordeal of a second trial. His hon. and learned friend seemed to him to be under a complete misapprehension as to the procedure to be adopted by the Court of Appeal in ordinary cases. He had with dogmatic vigour more than once said that there must be a re-trial of these complicated issues. He altogether protested against the opinion that any such proceeding was necessary. The Court of Appeal in London was constantly dealing with vexed questions of fact in civil actions, and in his experience, though they had power under existing rules to have witnesses called before them, it was exceedingly rare that they ever adopted this course. In criminal cases the evidence that had already been taken, and the summing up of the learned

Judge, would constitute the materials which the tribunal would be called upon to consider. If it was suggested that there were new witnesses who could throw a new light on the case, he supposed that either their affidavits would be produced or the Court would have a statement taken by some competent official. The Court would consider whether those statements were reliable or not, and whether they materially affected the issues which had already been decided. Then, said the hon. and learned Member: "Oh, but you may have a trial in which it is suggested that a number of the witnesses ought to be sworn over again," and he assumed that the only method under the Bill itself would be to summon all those witnesses and to examine them again. It was possible, however, that the Court might send one of its own members to hear the statements of these witnesses and to form an opinion upon their reliability, with power to communicate his views to his fellow members, or the Court might send a Commissioner who might take the evidence of the witnesses on oath and subject them to cross-examination. It would be a great hardship if a number of local witnesses had to be called to London in order that the whole trial might be gone through afresh. The result of the examination of the materials by the Court of Criminal Appeal would be to elicit vital facts and points, and if on those points it was suggested that new evidence could be collected the Court had power to collect that evidence. If it was suggested that the examination of some witness who was present at the trial would throw considerable light on the inquiry, he might be called. So that the House would see, there was ample machinery to enable the Court to do all that the Home Secretary could do at the present time. His right hon. friend the Home Secretary informed him that it was quite foreign to the practice of the Home Office to go through a process of re-trial. They did not have all the witnesses up and reconstruct the case in the manner which had been suggested. If that was not necessary in the case of the Home Office—the ideal tribunal of his hon. and learned friend—why was it necessary for this Court of Criminal Appeal? As a matter of fact the Court would have ample power to get at the truth in the way they thought proper. What were the objections to a new trial? He submitted in the first place that it was desirable in the interests of criminal justice that there should be one trial, and one trial only. There should also be a Court of review with the responsibility of deciding whether that trial had been satisfactory and whether the conviction should be quashed or not. The alternative method of his hon. and learned friends was derived purely from civil proceedings. In civil proceedings they had two parties who were struggling to establish some right which was in controversy. The Court of Appeal might come to the conclusion that the trial by a jury had been for some reason unfairly or unsatisfactorily conducted. They might say to the parties, "If you are determined to litigate to a conclusion you must submit to a new trial." That analogy, he submitted, had no parallel in the administration of criminal law. There were no parties in the sense he had described. There was no struggle for a victory. There was the State represented by the Crown which was bringing an accused person to justice, who had the right to have his guilt determined by the verdict of the jury. If the verdict of the jury had convicted him his rights were all exhausted as the law now stood. In the absence of some error on the part of the tribunal the door was closed, and there was no hope for him except by an appeal to the clemency of the Crown through the Home Secretary. What was suggested was that they should try to see if something more could not be done; and if so, was not the proposal in the Bill the best that could be done for the accused person? What was the proposal? What the Government said was this: If a prisoner wished that his case should be subjected to review by three of the most trained judicial intellects that the country could bring to bear on it he must ask for leave to appeal and the Court must examine the evidence, must consider the summing-up of the judge, and must take all the steps which were necessary to satisfy themselves whether the verdict of the jury was so far satisfactory that the executive would be justified in enforcing it. If they came to the conclusion that it was a satisfactory verdict there was no reason why they should not give effect to that view, and they would, as a matter of fact, express that opinion. If, on the other hand, they concluded that the verdict could not be regarded as satisfactory they would express an opinion to that effect. That was what was offered by this Bill. He did not think it was unsatisfactory. It certainly afforded no ground for complaint on the part of the prisoner, and he thought it would ensure to the satisfaction of the community that public justice was being done. He asked them to think for a moment of the scandal of this suggested new trial. Suppose they had a criminal cause like a great murder trial which occupied several days, and in the course of which a vast amount of evidence was submitted. The jury came to a particular conclusion, and it might be that public sympathy was considerably moved in connection with the case. Although the Court thought the verdict wrong, was that ordeal to be gone through over again? Was it desirable that, having once tried and once convicted that person under such painful circumstances, they should go through all that proceeding again in the interests of some abstract standard of justice? He thought that when the jury had convicted a prisoner and he was given an opportunity of having the materials fully reviewed by a competent body, which decided that there was no ground for disturbing the verdict, then they should feel satisfied in leaving the man in prison. If the Court on the other hand thought that there had been on the part of the jury a misconception of the issue as it was left to them by the Judge, or that the Judge had directed the attention of the jury to what were really subsidiary and not critical considerations, and that therefore the trial had not been satisfactory, then the verdict should be set aside. What did his hon. and learned friends say? They said that, having arrived at that conclusion, the Court should not give effect to it by releasing the prisoner but that they must direct that the question be tried again. He used the word "must," because he took it that the "may" of his hon. and learned friends might mean "must." He believed that if a new trial was provided for, there would be a tendency to have a repetition of criminal trials in a great number of cases. His hon. and learned friends must consider this difficulty. They were in this dilemma. It was perfectly clear that no new trial could be ordered unless there was serious doubt and unless in the opinion of the Court of Appeal justice demanded it. If the Court sent down a case to be tried again because there was such a doubt in it that justice demanded it should be tried again, the prisoner was entitled to the benefit of that doubt and would get it as a matter of course. So that the very ground on which a new trial was ordered, namely, that a doubt existed, would be the ground on which the prisoner was entitled to an acquittal.

Mr. RAWLINSON: Or if there are fresh facts.

*Sir JOHN WALTON said that, apart from fresh facts, they would have the defence of prisoners in these cases reduced to a common formula. They would be told that a former jury convicted, and that the Court of Appeal having examined the evidence had come to the conclusion that the verdict was unsatisfactory, and had ordered a new trial. They would be told that there was a doubt, and an irresistible plea would be made to the jury to give the prisoner the benefit of the doubt. The result was that in many cases the acquittal of a prisoner who had been ordered to be tried again would follow almost as a matter of course. Then in the case of fresh evidence, was it wise to have a new trial with all the disadvantage of cost and difficulty attending that investigation? If they had fresh evidence that evidence must be brought before the consideration of the Court of Appeal. It would be collected in the various ways he had indicated. It would be the subject of affidavits obtained either by a commissioner or by a member of the Court. The Court would then see whether the evidence had a bearing on the trial, whether it was reliable, whether it was likely to have weight, and whether they were satisfied that it was true. Having ascertained all those points, why should not the Court of Appeal give effect to that evidence? They knew all the issues, and they knew how the jury had decided. Why should they not, just as well as a jury, consider the bearing of that new evidence on the issues which had already been determined? The jury had found against the man, and he was now before as competent a tribunal of either law or fact as could be found in either this or any other country. He could not see why they should hesitate to accept the findings of the Court on the question whether the new evidence it was proposed to introduce should or should not alter the verdict before them. There would be no danger to the community and no unsatisfactory operation of the criminal law. There was only one other observation, and it was this: The practical difficulty in the way of providing for new trials was enormous. In the first place, a man could not be tried over again at his own expense. He must be defended at the expense of the country. Witnesses must all be kept for an indefinite period at the public expense, and if the assizes were held in the West of England, say, in February and November, during the whole of this interval a large number of persons would have to be kept more or less in hand (many of them boarded and lodged to prevent them going abroad) ready for the new trial. Not only were the practical difficulties in the way of arranging for a new trial very great, but in his opinion that method was demanded neither in the interests of the accused nor in the interests of justice. They were under no obligation to have a man tried twice over by a jury who had already had his right of trial by jury exhausted. The provision of the Bill was the simplest, safest, and most satisfactory remedy the Government could offer.

MR. LANE-FOX said the hon. Gentleman had argued very vigorously against the proposal, but his arguments might have been used in a more emphatic form against the proposal in the Bill of the previous year. In that Bill they had not an optional proposal as was suggested. The trial was made obligatory. The Home Secretary had power just now to alter sentences. If this Bill passed there would be nothing whatever between letting a man off altogether or leaving his conviction to stand. It seemed to him, therefore, that the presumption would be against the man, because unless the Court was satisfied the evidence was such that they could acquit him they would be bound to leave the conviction as it was. There would be no chance of intervention like the Home Secretary's. He spoke, of course, under correction. The question of expense was also dealt with by the Attorney-General, who had used words about an abstract standard of justice, and rather contemptuously applied them to the objection which was being urged against the clause. It seemed to him there was considerable expense now in cases where the jury disagreed. Still, if by re-trial they gained pure justice it was worth a considerable amount.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough) said he had an Amendment on the Paper on the subject of whether the Court of Appeal in criminal cases should have the power of ordering a new trial. His Amendment was to the effect that where new facts, material to the issue of the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, were brought before the Court of Appeal which were not before the jury in the Court below, in that case, at any rate, the Court of Appeal should have in their discretion the right to direct a new trial. Did hon. Members realise what a change was being brought into our criminal law administration? This particular Bill was a unique Bill. If differed from all previous Bills establishing a Criminal Court of Appeal. He did not think it lay with the Attorney-General to put on one side as preposterous the idea of granting a new trial in criminal cases, because provision had been made for a new trial in every previous Bill establishing such a Court. It was so in the Criminal Code Bill of 1878, introduced by Sir James Stephen and other great authorities, in the Bill introduced by the Lord Chancellor in the other House last year, and in every intermediate Bill.

But the Bill before the House provided in no case that there should be granted a new trial. The Amendment gave discretion to the Court to order a new trial when there were new facts. A case could easily be conceived in which new and material facts might be brought before the Court of Appeal which were quite sufficient to raise doubt and yet not sufficient to make it clear that the prisoner's conviction ought to be quashed. What was to happen in that case ? The Judges might be divided. He had heard it said that in any such case where there was a doubt the Judges would quash the conviction, and that had been spoken of as if it was the natural thing to do. If that were so it would be very bad for the community. True, it was better that ten guilty men should be acquitted than that one innocent man should be convicted, but it was also a saying in the law "*Judex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur.*" Supposing the Judges were two to one in favour of upholding the conviction, what would happen ? The prisoner would have had no trial by jury at all. Not in the Court below because *ex hypothesi* the new facts were material facts which were not brought before the attention of the jury, while in the Court of Appeal the Judges would have usurped the functions of the jury. There was a very well-known saying of Lord Hardwicke that it would be a very bad day for the administration of law in this country if ever the separate functions of Judge and jury got confused. The Judge's function was to determine the law and the jury's to find the facts. Might he bring before the House what the late Mr. Montagu Williams used to say was the most remarkable case he had ever known—the Hatton Garden Case. The facts might be put very briefly. An Italian was put on his trial for the murder of a man in a fracas in a public-house in Hatton Garden. He was brought to trial and convicted on what seemed the clearest possible evidence. The murder was committed by an Italian—he was the only Italian. Several witnesses swore they had known him for years and he was actually taken to the death-bed of the man who was murdered and identified by him. He was sentenced to death. Shortly afterwards suspicion fell upon another man who had fled from London. He was brought back and put on his trial for manslaughter and he was convicted. They had the extraordinary case of a man being convicted of murder and sentenced to death and another man being convicted on the same facts of manslaughter. But the difficulty was solved, because by a fortunate accident there was a second indictment against the first man, who was again put upon his trial, and acquitted. They could not have that fresh trial under the present Bill, and it would mean that the Judges would have to say which of the two men was the guilty party. That was a responsibility which they ought not to put on the Judges. For those reasons he would, if his hon. and learned friend pressed the matter to a division, support him in the lobby.

The House divided :—Ayes, 41 ; Noes, 116. (Division List No. 342.

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bertram, Julius
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Forster, Henry William
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd)
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ridsdale, E. A.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,F. E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—
Mr. Salter and Mr. Cave.

NOES.

Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner, J.F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. (Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down S.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, C. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare N.)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverhampton)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H (Somers't, E).
Toulmin, George
Walters, John Tudor
Walter, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Mr. LYTTELTON thought the time had arrived when the debate should cease. During the last hour and a half they had had two Amendments moved by his hon. friend behind him which the Attorney-General was compelled to admit were required, for he had admitted that the Bill as it stood required Amendment, and had promised to amend it. With regard to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge a second admission was made in the fullest and frankest terms, and was bound to be made by the Attorney-General, that the subject was one of the greatest importance. They had now debated the Bill for nearly five hours. The Patronage Secretary seemed to be pleased at that. He would remind him that an understanding was given by the Attorney-General that the Bill should not be taken on a Friday if it could possibly be avoided, and therefore the understanding which the Patronage Secretary had endeavoured to put forward that night really did not exist in fact at all.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY said the understanding was with the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University who had endorsed all that he had said. The right hon. Gentleman could not get behind that, while the Attorney-General had denied more than once that he had given any pledge.

Mr. LYTTELTON said he had never

said there had been a pledge. He had said there had been an understanding that the matter should not be discussed on a Friday. No one who had heard the debate could possibly charge anyone with obstruction. If such charge were made it would have to be made against hon. Members opposite as well as against the Opposition, for in every division and every discussion they had had the support of some Ministerialists. Considering that the matter had been repeatedly declared by the Government to be of importance, and considering that the Attorney-General recognised in the Committee upstairs that he had been extremely well treated by the Opposition' he thought it was straining the powers of the Government to continue the debate. It was the only debate they had had since the Second Reading which was on a Friday, and the entirety of it had been taken between the hours of eleven and four o'clock. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the further consideration of the Bill, as amended, be now adjourned."

The House divided :—Ayes, 42 ; Noes, 110. (Division List No. 343.)

AYES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Major Leslie
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W.)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas

Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh,Central
Raphael, Herbert H.
Richards,T.F(Wolverhampton)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, V. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E)
Toulmin, George
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke ((York, E. R.)
Whiteley, John Henry(Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 32; Noes, 109. (Division List No. 344.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Forster, Henry William
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, SirClement (Shrewsbury)
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Rawlinson and Mr. John O'Connor.

NOES.

Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barry,RedmondJ.(Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Clough, William
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lough, Thomas
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald

Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Partingson, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Starkey, John R.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. WH (Somerset, E.)
Toulmin, George
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. RAWLINSON moved, after the word "other" to insert the words "less severe." The effect of the Amendment, he said, was this: As the Bill stood now, if a man appealed from his sentence the Court of Appeal could reduce his sentence or they could increase it. The object of the Amendment was to prevent the Court increasing sentences; that was to say, they must either leave a sentence as it was or reduce it. The Amendment was in accordance with the ordinary rules of fair-play and of English justice in the criminal law as it stood at the present time. If a man wished to appeal from a sentence because he believed that, say, a term of six months imprisonment was an excessive sentence, then the Bill stepped in and held out a threat to him so as to prevent him using that right of appeal. The idea appeared to be to make the man believe that he had better not appeal in that way, because if he did he might get his sentence increased to nine months. Unless a man had the gambling spirit he would probably take his six months and say no more about it. Was that a fair way of dealing with prisoners under the criminal law? He submitted that it was not. He believed that the House of Commons would not lend itself lightly to such a proceeding. If they accepted the Amendment which he suggested, it would prevent the Court of Appeal increasing a sentence simply for the purpose of deterring other persons from appealing in the same way. The speech of the present Lord Chancellor put in stronger language than he could do the undesirability of appeal in the form at present in the Bill. The Lord Chancellor said it was not necessary to introduce an artificial limit such as the Bill (that was the Bill of the hon. Member below the gangway) proposed, to the effect that the Court of Criminal Appeal should have power to increase sentences. That was repugnant to the entire spirit of the criminal law. The spirit of the criminal law always inclined towards mercy rather than severity. Let the Courts diminish sentences as much as they pleased, but to increase them was revolting to everyone and to the custom and the temper of our Courts of Justice. That speech of the Lord Chancellor's, the hon. and learned Member continued, expressed the distinct arguments which he was putting before the House. It was revolting to the ordinary principles carried out in our Courts of Justice at the present time that such extraordinary powers should be given to the Court of Criminal Appeal.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR seconded the Amendment. He had noticed that for a long time past in that House they had been following wherever they could Continental procedure. They had in many cases amended to advantage their procedure by following the example of the Continent. For example, they had given a right to the prisoner to go into the witness-box and to testify in his own behalf. But if there was one thing more than another in Continental procedure that the legal mind of this country disapproved of, it was the power to increase the sentences given in Courts of First Instance. It was because he believed that power would be repugnant to those engaged in the practice of law in this country that he seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 3, line 29, after the words 'other,' to insert the words 'less severe.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*SIR JOHN WALTON said that he did not think the Amendment was necessary in order to give effect to the very natural wishes of the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, that a man who appealed on the ground that his sentence was too severe was to have the severity of the sentence increased. He submitted, however, that the Bill, as it was now drawn, was in its proper form; because one must consider how the question arose. When an appeal was brought on the part of a convicted person who said that he had been improperly or excessively punished, he was dissatisfied with the opinion of the tribunal which had sentenced him. He said either that period of imprisonment had been too long, or that it was a case in which the sentence ought not to have been inflicted at all, or that he ought to have been sentenced as a misdemeanant in the first class. What did that proceeding mean? Its effect was that a petition was addressed to the Court of Appeal to substitute its view for the view of the tribunal whose decision was challenged. When they appealed to Cæsar and asked for Cæsar's opinion, surely they must accept it. When a man said that he was dissatisfied with his sentence on one of the grounds stated, the Court of Appeal were entitled to consider the sentence. The practical result was this, that they applied to the case principles of general application. It was because the appellant complained that the principles of general and just application were not present in the tribunal from which he appealed that he asked the Court of Appeal to apply these principles. Was penal servitude more or less severe than imprisonment with hard labour? In the general opinion of the profession two years imprisonment with hard labour was infinitely more severe than three years of penal servitude, and it became a question of opinion whether the Court below pronounced a sentence which was more or less severe. The Court might say, "You have been sentenced to penal servitude. We think the class of offence demands a sentence of twelve months imprisonment." Probably the accused would rather have, say, three years penal servitude than the far more rigorous sentence of one year's imprisonment. It would result in this, that the Court of Criminal Appeal would have to ask the accused person which he would prefer and they would have the accused person exercising a choice. That was an anomalous and undignified situation. He would suggest that the better way was that if an appeal was brought against the sentence the Court of Criminal Appeal should have full and not restricted powers of dealing with it. They should be able to inflict an alternative sentence which in their opinion was appropriate.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said that so far as he read the Bill, it was entirely in the option of the Court of Criminal Appeal to give a more or less severe punishment. He was bound to support the Attorney-General. They did not want to encourage unnecessary appeals, and the Amendment would do so.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said he could not help thinking the Amendment would turn out to be of considerable practical importance. After listening to the speech of the Attorney-General he had come to the conclusion that the weight of argument in this matter was in favour of the Amendment. As had been pointed out, the matter was not one for lawyers primarily, but for laymen. The man whom the Bill concerned was not the lawyer, but the man in the dock. Hon. Gentlemen on both sides would agree that the number of lawyers who found themselves in that position was for some inexplicable reason singularly small. What they suggested was that it should be specifically guaranteed to the man who appealed against his sentence that justice should not turn against him so that he was put in a worse position than if the Court had never existed. The Attorney-General did not see that any security was necessary. He thought it would rarely, if ever, be necessary. In other words he confessed that the man might find himself in a position which every man in the House would agree ought not to be possible. The hon. and learned Gentleman said he could scarcely imagine such a case. The case would be very hard, very remarkable, very rare. But if it could occur, they ought to make the small alteration which was suggested. The Attorney-General said that when a man appealed to Cæsar he must abide by the decision of Cæsar. Yes, but it was that House that was Cæsar. It was for that House to set up that Court, and theirs was the responsibility in connection with it. Finally, the hon. and learned Gentleman used an argument which, with all respect, was unworthy, when he said it was a matter of conjecture and opinion whether or not one sentence was more severe than another. If that was so, the words proposed to be taken out should be taken out if only on the ground that they were on the hon. and learned Gentleman's own showing, meaningless.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER considered the Government were perfectly right in resisting the Amendment. It was not a question of a more merciful or severer sentence, but of a just sentence. If a man asked for a just sentence the Courts ought to pass a just sentence without respect to a sentence in another Court. If the Amendment were carried there would be a number of frivolous appeals.

MR. RAWLINSON said the Court was to take the place of the Home Secretary as regarded revision of sentence. The Home Secretary had power to alter a sentence at the present time, but none to increase. He supposed the Home Secretary knew what sentence was more and less severe. If the Bill was really to be in favour of prisoners, prisoners ought not to be placed in a worse position than before.

*MR. CAVE moved to leave out subsection 2 of Clause 5. He thought the best argument he could use in favour of the Amendment was to read the subsection. It would somewhat surprise those Members who had not read it. It was—

> "Where an appellant has been convicted of an offence and the jury could on the indictment have found him guilty of some other offence, and on the finding of the jury it appears to the Court of Criminal Appeal that the jury must have been satisfied of facts which proved him guilty of that other offence, the Court may instead of allowing or dismissing the appeal substitute for the verdict found by the jury a verdict of guilty of that other offence and pass such sentence in substitution for the sentence passed at the trial as they think proper."

This was one of the most extraordinary provisions in the Bill. The effect of it was that a man who had been tried for a certain offence and had been convicted and sentenced, and who appealed, and satisfied the Court of Appeal that he had not been properly convicted of that offence, could yet without a further trial be sentenced for another offence. If the Court of Appeal came to the conclusion that he was not guilty of offence A, they might yet convict him of offence B, an offence with which he had never been charged, and for which he had never been put on his trial, and sentence him for that offence. If the man had been charged with the second offence he might have been able to defend himself, and the facts material to that charge would have been considered and brought before the jury. But under this provision the man was never given a chance of taking this course. The Court might be satisfied that the jury must have thought the prisoner guilty of the second offence, but the jury had not found a verdict to that effect, and it seemed improper that the man should be convicted of an offence of which he had never in fact been found by a jury to be guilty. Surely the proper remedy was to order a new trial. He was informed that in Committee the sub-section was insisted on, but he hoped the Government would see fit to omit it now.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.

"In page 3, line 38, to leave out Subsection (2) of Clause 5."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR said he would like to know whether the Attorney-General could so alter the sub-section as to make it certain that there should be no increase of the sentences. There were many cases where if a man was indicted for a serious offence such as murder he might be found guilty of manslaughter, but if a man was brought before the Court of Appeal after being found guilty of manslaughter the verdict could be increased to murder, according to the words of the clause. In like manner a man was often charged with a serious offence of firing at with intent to kill, or with assault and was found guilty of a lesser offence. He thought that it was the spirit of the proposed law that sentences should not be increased, but according to the wording of the clause the sentence might be increased. He did not say he would go into the lobby with his hon. friend, but he would like some assurance that the Court would not be able to take the action he had mentioned. He wished to hear what the Attorney-General had to say in regard to the matter before making up his mind which lobby he would go into.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said he was astonished that his hon. and learned friend should have not only failed to understand that clause of the Bill, but suggested that it was unreasonable and incapable of defence. His hon. and learned friend had overlooked the whole category of cases with which the clause proposed to deal. It was essential that a Court of Criminal Appeal should have power to take some action in the cases contemplated. In a charge of murder in which the jury might have found the prisoner guilty of manslaughter, the case might be one in which the question whether murder could or could not have been found was still open to argument, the Court of Appeal might come to the conclusion that the verdict for murder could not stand, but the minor offence of manslaughter was committed. Without the clause the Court of Appeal must set that man free, which would be reducing their functions to an absurdity. It was not necessary that there should be a second count in the indictment. He had appeared in many cases where there had been no second count. On the count of murder it was possible to find manslaughter, on a charge of rape it was possible to find criminal assault or indecent assault. It was obvious that the Court of Appeal must have the power to arrive at the conclusion that the larger offence involved the lesser. On that principle they ought to be able to punish a man for the less offence. He really did not know a case in which the relationship between the larger and the smaller case was not a relationship of larger and less. But in order to prevent any element of opinion arising there they simply put in the words, "shall pass such sentence in substitution of the sentence passed at the trial." If they were to put in the words "such less sentence" or "in relation to such less sentence," in the clause it would raise questions of opinion. For instance, in connection with the case of a charge of larceny, was felonious receiving to be considered a less offence or a greater offence? Was receiving a greater offence than stealing, or a less offence? He had heard different opinions expressed on that point, and therefore he thought it necessary to say that the two offences must be different, but not necessarily "greater" and "less." Still in finding a man guilty of one the Court must clearly find that the jury considered him to be guilty. There was a very large category of cases to which this section applied. They were all of the same nature. For example, on a charge of obtaining money by false pretences they could find a man guilty of larceny by a trick. The facts must be such that the Court could come to the conclusion that the jury put a wrong construction on the case. In his view that was clear, and he opposed the Amendment.

MR. BOTTOMLEY asked the hon. and learned Attorney-General if he would be good enough to enlighten the House on one specific point he wished to put to him under this sub-section. Would it be competent for the Court of Criminal Appeal sitting on a case of manslaughter to find the appellant guilty of murder?

SIR JOHN WALTON said that in his opinion it would clearly not be possible. He thought if the hon. Member looked at the section he would see that they could not do so. The only case that could arise was that of an indictment for murder and a conviction for murder. The Court of Appeal must find that the jury must have decided the prisoners guilt of manslaughter, which was the other offence of which, under the Statute, the jury could have convicted him of.

MR. BOWLES remarked that the hon. and learned Attorney-General had said that under this section as it stood it would be competent to turn a jury's verdict of murder into a verdict of manslaughter. He said, however, that it would not be competent for the Court of Appeal to reverse that process. He had no doubt that since the Attorney-General assured them that it was so, it was so, but from merely reading the section he did not gather that opinion. The Attorney-General appeared to assume that the jury in putting its wrong construction upon the facts always put too harsh a construction. What he thought the House would like to have an assurance from the Attorney-General upon was this: What was to happen in the Court of Criminal Appeal when the jury in the Court of First Instance put a construction on the facts which was not too harsh, but too lenient? The jury having found on a certain set of facts, for reasons of their own, that a case was one not of murder but of manslaughter, was there anything in this section which under those circumstances would prevent the Court of Criminal Appeal from acting in the reverse direction? Was there anything to prevent the Court of Appeal saying, "It is true that the jury said that in their opinion it was only manslaughter; but we are lawyers, we are much wiser on this matter of fact than the jury from the locality which tried the case. We say as lawyers, the facts have been found to be so and so, that it must be held to be murder." That surely was a serious matter. It was a matter as regards which they were entitled to something more than a mere assertion of the hon. and learned Gentleman, because it was evident that the section might work both ways. They would therefore have an avowal by the House of Commons for the first time in the history of the country that a man might be convicted and punished not by the unanimous agreement of a jury of his fellow countrymen, but by agreement of a majority of Judges sitting in London. The opinion of the lawyer was set above the opinion of the lay juror—above what was usually the reasonable and sound opinion of twelve men taken from the district haphazard. When they allowed that instructed legal opinion, acting without a jury, to produce results of that kind he maintained that the House of Commons was clearly bound to be quite sure on the point that this Court, which might work such great changes in lightening sentences under this section, would not work far more dangerous changes in the way of increasing sentences.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) said that while he was in favour of the general principle of the Bill, he confessed that the last two Amendments had raised rather disquieting considerations in his mind. After reading over the section he was bound to say that it appeared to him that if the Court of Appeal could reduce the major offence to the minor offence, there was no reason why they should not act in the opposite direction. The Bill was intended to work for the amelioration of the law, but this clause and the preceding clause might, it seemed to him, work in the direction of aggravating the severity of the administration of the law. He repeated that he felt somewhat disquieted by the considerations raised in connection with this Amendment, and he trusted that the clause might be modified in accordance with it.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER confessed that he had great difficulty in seeing that the meaning attached to the sub-section by the hon. and learned Attorney-General was the only meaning. Let them assume the case of a man who was indicted for rape. Upon that indictment the jury could, if it pleased, find a man guilty of indecent assault. Let them suppose that on that indictment the man was found guilty of indecent assault, and that against that conviction he appealed. The Court of Appeal on hearing the case are satisfied not only that there was an indecent assault, but that there were present in fact all the essential facts of rape. In those circumstances how would the matter stand under this sub-section? The appellant had been convicted of the offence of indecent assault and the Court of Appeal had found him guilty of some other offence—namely, that of rape. On the finding of the jury it appeared that the Court of Criminal Appeal must be satisfied that it was proved he was guilty of rape. The Court of Appeal would then substitute for the verdict found by the jury a verdict of guilty of rape, and would pass such sentence in substitution for the sentence passed at the trial as they thought proper—that was, a severer sentence. It appeared to him to be very difficult indeed to be satisfied with the view expressed by the Attorney-General that the only meaning of the sub-section was the meaning he had put upon it. If he substituted the word "lesser" for the word "other" throughout the sub-section he would amply secure the end that he aimed at.

*SIR JOHN WALTON did not see the least difficulty in construing this section in the spirit of the speech which he had addressed to the House. He had avoided the use of the expression "lesser" or "greater" because it imputed a difference of opinion. He had already given the House various instances in which this element of opinion might be introduced. He thought they could not discriminate by using as an alternative expression "major" and "minor," but they might in his view discriminate by using "other offence" and "the other offence." If hon. Members looked at the first part of the sub-section they would see that it only applied to cases in which by reason of the statute the jury might find a man guilty of some other offence than that with which he was charged. If the finding of the jury was murder, the jury must have been satisfied that the man was guilty of manslaughter. If he was indicted for murder they had in manslaughter that other offence. It was idle to talk of the man as being convicted by the Court without having been convicted by the jury in such a case, because the jury had convicted him of the major offence.

MR. BOWLES: What of the reverse case?

SIR JOHN WALTON said there was no reverse case. The only case provided for was where on an indictment for the major charge the man might be found guilty on the minor: where, on a charge of murder, manslaughter might be found; on a charge of maliciously wounding, unlawfully wounding; on a charge of infanticide, concealment of birth; on a charge of rape, indecent assault. The words were in the Bill as originally introduced, and if there was any obscurity about them a change could be effected.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR asked if the case did not arise where the Court might consider the jury were satisfied as to facts which involved in a verdict of murder when they found manslaughter?

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) said the debate had raised considerable doubt in his mind as to the effect of the clause. The Attorney-General said the only appeal contemplated under the clause was from a conviction for a major offence which the prisoner sought to have reduced to a minor. Was there anything in the Act that prevented the Court of Appeal from turning a conviction on the minor offence into a conviction on the major? Was there any clause that prevented the Court of Appeal increasing a conviction from manslaughter to murder? That raised an entirely new principle in British law—that a man could be convicted on a charge possibly not made against him at all, in regard to which, indeed, no evidence might have been brought before the jury.

MR. RAWLINSON said he had raised the point on Second Reading and in Committee, and it had not yet been answered. The case he put was this. A man was indicted for murder. The jury found him guilty of manslaughter. He appealed and the facts indicated to the Court of Appeal that the man was guilty of murder. Let them read the section. It appeared that where an appellant had been convicted of an offence—say manslaughter—and a jury could on an indictment have found him guilty of some offence—murder—and when on the finding of the jury it appeared to the Court of Criminal Appeal that the jury must have been satisfied of the facts which proved the man guilty of that other offence—murder—the Court might substitute for the verdict found by the jury—manslaughter—a verdict of guilty of that other offence—murder.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. REDMOND BARRY, Tyrone, N.) said that the difference between manslaughter and murder was the absence or presence of malice as a fact. If the jury found a man guilty of manslaughter they must be taken as having negatived the fact of malice.

*MR. CAVE said the Attorney-General endeavoured to lead the House to believe that he (Mr. Cave) had so little experience in connection with the Criminal Law that he had overlooked the whole class of cases to which this sub-clause related. He did not claim to be learned in the Criminal Law, but he certainly knew the very elementary rules which the Attorney-General had put before the House. He was also in the habit of applying the principles of fair play, and he held that to enable a Court to alter the verdict of a jury in the manner proposed was an infringement of those principles of the fair play which were a part of British law. He had moved his Amendment knowing perfectly well the facts to which the Attorney-General had referred, and he thought the speeches afterwards made had justified his action. He thought that it was his duty to press for a division.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 91; Noes, 44. (Division List No. 345.)

AYES.

Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Clough, William
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grins'td)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Richards, T. F (Wolverhampton)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W H (Somerset, E.)
Toulmin, George
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Catslereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene

Mr. Rawlinson

Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Grayson, Albert Victor
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kilbride, Denis
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
Magnus, Sir Philip
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, Sohn Frederick Peel
Renton, Major Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Cave and Mr. Staveley-Hill.

Mr. RAWLINSON said the next Amendment he had to move was a purely technical one to leave out the word "verdict," and insert the word "finding." He would not trouble the House to divide on it, but he could not imagine where the wording came from. He imagined it was meant to apply in the case where a jury had found a special finding. It was, however, purely a question of drafting. He imagined the Attorney-General would accept it.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 9, to leave out the word 'verdict' and insert the word "finding.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'verdict' stand part of the Bill."

Sir JOHN WALTON said he did not know where his hon. and learned friend had got his information as to drafting of Acts of Parliament. The word used was the right word, and was used advisedly, not in the sloppy, wishy-washy way the hon. and learned Gentleman supposed. It was proper that the word should be there.

Mr. RAWLINSON wished to point out that possibly if the Attorney-General had gone on reading he would have found that the special verdict was a technical point. He did not, however, wish to detain the House with the matter.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. RAWLINSON moved to leave out Subsection 4. The effect of the section as it stood was that when a person who was charged with an offence appealed against the sentence the Court of Appeal might come to the conclusion that he had committed the offence, but was mad at the time he committed it. By that clause the Court had power to detain him during His Majesty's pleasure. The power they were giving to the Court of Appeal was that the Court could come to the conclusion that the man was insane at the time he committed the act and bring in a verdict to that effect. It was one of the points he had brought before the House in connection with the granting of a new trial. Quite apart from the question of trial by jury he submitted that it was absolutely wrong that a man should be found insane who never set up that defence and did not wish that defence set up.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 4, line 17, to leave out subsection (4) of Clause 5."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'that,' in page 4, line 18, stand part of the Bill."

Sir JOHN WALTON said he could not accept the Amendment. It very often happened that counsel put forward the defence with a view to getting the prisoner off.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY said he had a slight Amendment to propose in Section 7 which said that anyone desirous of appealing to the Court of Criminal Appeal must do so within ten days of the conviction. The section went on to say that the Court of Criminal Appeal might extend the time for the application for leave to appeal, but there was this extraordinary limitation in the words "except in the case of a conviction involving sentence of death." That meant that if the day before the ten days was up the prisoner under sentence of death was in a position to produce important evidence if he was given a few days time, the Court of Appeal could not extend the time for a week or ten days. It might be the case that there was a witness on the sea coming over to prove the man's innocence, but the proceedings could not be delayed. He therefore moved to leave out the words referred to.

The Amendment was not seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 39, after the word 'sentence' to insert the word 'only.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

SIR JOHN WALTON said he accepted the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. RAWLINSON moved an Amendment which, he said, proposed to give power not only to the Court of Appeal, but also to the Court which tried the case, to give legal assistance to the appellant prisoner if they thought it right to do so. Assuming a man was convicted in a distant part or country he could not perhaps come up to the Court of Appeal to lay his case before them. Under the Bill they were the only tribunal which could grant legal aid and he now proposed to give power also to the court which tried the case if they thought there were facts about the case which warranted them in exercising it. That power would in such case be placed in the hands of the Chairman of Quarter Sessions or the Judge of Assizes if they thought fit to certify legal aid to the prisoner. Magistrates had power to grant legal aid to prisoners whom they were committing to quarter sessions or assizes and his Amendment was a most reasonable one.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 7, after the word 'appeal' to add the words, 'or the Court that has tried the criminal.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR JOHN WALTON said the House had already decided that leave to appeal was to be given by the Court of Appeal and not by the Judge who had tried the case. The proper person to assign the counsel or solicitor to give legal aid was the person who gave the leave to appeal. Care would no doubt be taken that the prisoner had proper legal assistance.

MR RAWLINSON said that he did not desire to press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RAWLINSON moved an Amendment to Clause 11 (right of appellant to be present) to provide that the appellant should have the right to be present at the hearing of the application for leave to appeal as well as at the hearing of the appeal. The Amendment, he said, was one that he should be inclined to press on the Attorney-General. He thought the House would be of opinion that the Amendment should be accepted seeing that its object was to ensure that an appellant, who, notwithstanding that he was in custody, was entitled to be present on the hearing of his appeal, should be entitled also to be present at the application for leave to appeal. It had been decided that the only tribunal which could give a prisoner that leave on a question of fact was the Court of Appeal, and it seemed to be in accordance with all known traditions of justice that the prisoner should be allowed to attend before that Court, because if he was refused leave, his rights of appeal were entirely dead. Once the Court had been persuaded into giving leave to appeal, the probability was that they would have been almost won over on the side of the prisoner. As the Bill stood now the prisoner had no right to appear in Court himself, but he could be detained in custody at the place where he was in any part of the country. Surely he was entitled to be present, being a most important party to the proceedings.

Amendment proposed to the Bill,

"In page 7, line 14, after the word "of," to insert the words 'his application for leave to appeal and on the hearing of.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*SIR JOHN WALTON said he could not accept the Amendment. He thought that the prisoner should be present as a matter of course and of right on the hearing of his appeal, but when the question was whether the prisoner should get leave to appeal or not his presence should be allowed only if it was necessary or desirable. He did not think that the prisoner should appear as a mere matter of course, because his attendance could only be secured at the cost of the Crown, and in many cases it would not be required.

MR. BOWLES did not agree with this barring out of a man from an action in a Court of Justice which might mean absolutely life or death to him. The application would be of enormous importance to the prisoner, almost of more importance than the trial. The man might have no counsel to represent him. He was not to be assigned a solicitor or counsel in the Court that had tried him. It was quite conceivable that the application for leave to appeal might be made before the Judges not only in the absence of the prisoner, but in the absence of anybody to represent him. He did not know what machinery was really contemplated; but it seemed to him, in view of the fact that this might be an overwhelmingly important matter to the unfortunate man, a very strange thing that the application was to be decided in his absence.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 30; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 346.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.HnSirAlex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Scott, Sir S.(Marylebone,W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Salter and Mr. Bowles.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Clough, William
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalziel, James Henry
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirDBrynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare,N.)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs.Leek)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh,Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpton
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H(Somerset,E.)
Toulmin, George

Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD moved the adjournment of the debate. The Government surely did not intend to continue the debate on so important a subject with Committees beginning at eleven o'clock. He was perfectly indifferent on the matter himself, as he was not concerned in any of the Committees to which he referred; but he could not conceive it as consistent with the dignity of the House for furthering the object the Government had in view that they should go on any longer.

Several Members rose to second, and Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. Caldwell) put the Question, that further proceedings on consideration be adjourned, when

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY said he hoped the Government would see their way——

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: I submit the Question has been put from the Chair. The Motion was put, and was seconded by no fewer than three people. One of them must have caught your eye. I submit the hon. Member would not be in order in addressing the House. In asking you to rule on this point, Sir, will you allow me to say that we who have been here all night desire that this Bill should go through?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. CALDWELL): Undoubtedly the Motion was seconded by several hon. Members, whereupon I put the Question from the Chair. If the noble Lord says he did not second it, then he can speak.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY asked which of the three gentlemen the Deputy-Speaker had called upon to second.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. CALDWELL): If the hon. Gentleman says he did not second, he can speak.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY: Who did second?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Several hon. Members rose at the same time and seconded.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY hoped the Government would see their way to accept the adjournment Motion. It was perfectly obvious that it was impossible for the House to conduct its business in that fashion. He did not know if hon. Members were aware that there were two most important Committees which met at eleven o'clock.

MR. AINSWORTH: On a point of order, Mr. Caldwell, I should like to ask you, Sir, has the Motion for adjournment been seconded?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. CALDWELL): The Motion has been seconded and put from the Chair.

MR. AINSWORTH: If the Motion has been seconded who has seconded it?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. CALDWELL): The noble Lord is speaking to the Motion properly put from the Chair, and it is not in order to interrupt, and go back on the seconding.

MR. AINSWORTH: Will you tell the House who has seconded?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: (Mr. CALDWELL) It is not necessary at this stage to tell the House. It is sufficient that the Motion has been duly seconded.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: If several people have seconded the Motion, are they all out of order if they desire to address you?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. CALDWELL): That Question is not in order just now.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY said he was pointing out that there were two of the most important Committees to sit at eleven o'clock that day. It was perfectly preposterous for any Government to ask the Members of the House to sit almost continuously from one day to another. It was perfectly impossible for Members to do their work adequately on those Committees when the House sat till that hour of the morning. The Government had altered the whole system of procedure to facilitate business. These Committees were set up to bring about some sort of devolution. If the net result was that not only were they to have the additional work entailed by the Committees but late sittings at that period of the session as well, the strain upon Members was one which it was most unfair of any Government to impose. It was all very well for the Government, and for Members on that side of the House, who were far greater in numbers, and who had been quite recently reinforced; it was far more easy for them to bear the strain of the sitting than it was for the members of the Opposition who were smaller in numbers and who had to take a more active part in the debate than members of the Government majority, whose sole duty was to register the opinions of the Member in charge of the Bill. Having regard to the state in which business had arrived he hoped the Government would accept the Motion.

*MR. GLADSTONE hoped the House would consent to finish the Bill. Very little remained to be done. If it had not been for the three Motions for the adjournment they would already have finished. His hon. friend had said he did not mind going on, but that he was thinking of his friends. He hoped the hon. Gentleman's friends would be prepared to go on.

MR. LANE-FOX said the right hon. Gentleman had alluded to the three Motions for the adjournment. He wished to say that the three Motions were perfectly justified, because it was an absolute farce that they should be asked to discuss a Bill of that importance during the small hours of the morning. There had been absolutely no obstruction, and no member of the Treasury Bench could say there had been any sign of obstruction. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had no right to complain of the adjournment Motions.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 36; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 347.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Major Leslie
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Colonel Lockwood and Viscount Helmsley.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T, H. D.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalziel, James Henry
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Richards,T.F(Wolverhampton)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.WH(Somerset,E.)
Toulmin, George
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,SirJohn L.(Leeds,S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. CAVE moved in Clause 13, to leave out "an" and to insert "a successful." He said his object in moving the Amendment was to ascertain how it was proposed that the expense of an unsuccessful appeal should be met. If they looked at Sub-section 2, which he was seeking to amend, they would find that all the expenses of the appellant should be defrayed in the same manner as the expenses of a prosecution in cases of felony. He was not sure he was right, but it appeared to him that the appellant whether he succeeded or not would draw on the county funds for his costs of the appeal. The fact was that whether he had an absolutely frivolous case or not the appellant only had to apply for leave to appeal and he got the whole of his costs out of county funds. It seemed to him that that was a great encouragement to frivolous appeals. He thought that where there was a good case for the appeal the costs should come out of public funds, but where there was not a good case they should not. As it was the Bill was an encouragement to every prisoner to try his luck on an appeal, for he could not lose anything, while he might get something by it.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 7, line 41, to leave out the word 'an,' and insert the words 'a successful'"—(*Mr. Cave*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'an' stand part of the Bill."

SIR JOHN WALTON said he did not think he could allow it to be said that a convicted prisoner would have appealed, but was too poor to pay his expenses. They ought to give the right of appeal even in the poorest cases. Only a small sum would be necessary.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 8, line 19, to leave out the word 'or,' and insert the words 'and subject to any directions which the Court of Criminal Appeal may give to the contrary on any appeal, the time during which the appellant.'"

"In page 8, line 25, after the word 'shall,' insert the words 'subject to any directions which may be given by the Court as aforesaid.'"—(*The Attorney-General.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. RAWLINSON said the meaning of his next Amendment was easily explained. As the Bill stood at the present time, if a man appealed directly he was in custody, from the moment his appeal started he was kept in custody, but in a different class from that in which he would be were he sent to hard labour or anything of that kind. The time he was kept waiting for his appeal, which must be a month or more, did not count as part of his sentence. The Amendment sought to alter that. It ensured that that period of time should count as part of the sentence, and that the court should allow it to be so taken. Remarks which he had made on a previous Amendment applied in a lesser degree to this one. The object of the Bill in its present form appeared to be to deter people from appealing. That was hardly fair. If a man did not succeed in his appeal the result might be that he would be kept in prison another month, because, as he had said, no account was taken of the time which he spent in custody while waiting for his appeal to come. That was not a fair way of proceeding, and he therefore hoped that the House would agree to the Amendment.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 8, lines 27 and 28, leave out the words 'the appeal is determined' and insert the words 'the sentence is passed.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*SIR JOHN WALTON rather objected to one observation which had fallen from the hon. and learned Member on two or three occasions during the discussion. He had said that various provisions had been put in the Bill with the object of deterring persons from appealing. That was not the object of this provision. If a prisoner said he had been wrongly convicted, and desired to get leave to appeal, he had a right to have that question determined. If, therefore, he had been sentenced to a term of penal servitude, they could not put him under the regimen for the period of time while he was awaiting the appeal that he would be under if he was fulfilling his sentence in the ordinary way. He was not, as a matter of fact, at that time serving the sentence. The sentence had been arrested, and therefore he must be dealt with on a different principle. When the matter was in Committee he agreed to the insertion of the words which he had just moved, and which would give the Court power to say whether that period should count as part of the sentence or not. If the Court thought it right to make that period count, it would of course be a relief to the prisoner. He thought the words in question which were suggested when the Bill was in Committee upstairs, met the views generally of those Members who were present.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER moved an Amendment to exempt from the work that may be done by a single Judge in Chambers the power of giving leave to appeal. His object in moving the Amendment, he said, was entirely to secure the general convenience of people concerned. Section 17, the House would see, gave the Court power to delegate to a Judge in Chambers, being one of their own body, certain matters. The powers which might be exercised related to a series of minor matters which it would be proper to deal with in Chambers. As the Court would be constituted by three Judges it would be a very great inconvenience that one Judge should break up the work of the Court. Therefore, the Chamber work, which would be considerable under the Act, would have to be performed by one of the other eight King's Bench Judges who would be members of the Court. One of the Judges of the King's Bench Division was always sitting in Chambers. It would, therefore, be by far the most economical and convenient course that the Chamber work under the Act should be done by the ordinary Judge in Chambers of the King's Bench Division. It would be the best plan to choose for Chamber work in the King's Bench Division one of the eight Judges who were members of the Court sitting in Chambers, and who would be able to deal with matters which arose under the Act in the ordinary course of his duties. The system proposed under the Bill would be very wasteful and costly. It would really be a farce and a waste of time and money to try to get the Judge in Chambers to hear applications for leave to appeal, because in the great majority of cases he would refuse relief, and the man would have the right of taking the case to the Court of Appeal. He ventured to suggest to the learned Attorney-General that it would be much more convenient in every way to confine the Chamber work under the Bill to the smaller matters which that section prescribed.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) considered that the application for leave to appeal ought to be made in the first case to the full Court. That might save a great deal of time and also two applications. In every case where the application was refused by the single Judge, it would afterwards be made to the three Judges.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 10, line 18, to leave out the words 'to give leave to appeal.'"—(*Mr. Salter.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR JOHN WALTON felt that there was a great deal of force in the argument which had been used, but he thought it was an argument that might be addressed to the Rule Committee of the Judges who would have to settle the procedure for the administration of the Act. It would be an advantage to leave the Bill as it was, trusting to such modifications being made in smaller matters as the Judges in Chambers might resolve upon.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 11, line 6, after the word 'being,' to insert the words "the Registrar of the Court of Criminal Appeal."

"In page 12, line 2, after the word 'inquisitions,' to insert the words 'and in cases where a person is dealt with by a court of quarter sessions as an incorrigible rogue under the Vagrancy Act, 1824.'"

"In page 12, line 7, to leave out the word 'Appeals," and insert the words "Notwithstanding anything in any other Act, an appeal shall lie.'"

"In page 12, line 7, to leave out the word 'convictions,' and to insert the words 'a conviction.'"

"In page 12, line 7, to leave out the word 'indictments,' and insert the word 'indictment.'"—(*The Attorney-General.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. RAWLINSON moved in Clause 20, after the word "law," to insert the words "whether tried in the King's Bench Division or at the assizes or at the quarter sessions." As the section stood at the present moment he said it might lead to a considerable amount of litigation.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 12, line 8, after the word 'law,' to insert the words 'whether tried in the King's Bench Division, or at the assizes, or at quarter sessions.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR JOHN WALTON did not think it was necessary to add the words.

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 12, line 9, to leave out from the word 'river,' to the word 'in,' in line 10, and to insert the words 'in whatever Court the indictment is tried.'"

"In page 12, line 10, to leave out the word 'convictions,' and insert the word 'conviction.'"

"In page 12, line 11, after the word 'action,' to insert the words 'tried at assizes.'"

"In page 13, line 3, to leave out the words twenty-fifth day of December,' and to insert the words 'eighteenth day of April.'"

"In page 13, line 3, to leave out the word 'seven,' and insert the word 'eight.'"—(*The Attorney-General.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read a third time."—(*Mr. Attorney-General.*)

MR. PIKE PEASE asked the Government to reconsider their decision in regard to Third Reading. They had had a very interesting debate and an able discussion. In the circumstances he hoped they would not be asked to pass the Third Reading.

*MR. GLADSTONE asked the House to read the Bill a third time. There was a very full discussion on the Second Reading, a quite satisfactory debate in Grand Committee, and they had now had eight or nine hours discussion on Report. There was nothing more to be said on the principle, and as they all knew the House of Lords was anxious to have Bills as soon as possible, in these circumstances he hoped the House would consent to read the Bill a third time.

MR. FLAVIN appealed to the Government not to ask the House to sit up another night, but to take the Third Reading now.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he was in favour of the Bill, but protested it was rather a strong order to ask the Opposition to give the Third Reading there and then. A good many Members wanted to discuss the Bill on the Third Reading, and he could not press them to assent that night.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 102; Noes, 28. (Division List No. 348.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm J (S. Pancras, W.)

Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H(Sussex,EGrinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Dalziel, James Henry
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gulland, John W.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Morrell, Philip
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Rickett, J. Compton
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Seaverns, J. H.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J.WH(Somerset,E.)
Toulmin, George
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hunt, Rowland
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Ridsdale, E. A.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Courthope and Mr. Staveley-Hill.

Bill read the third time and passed.

IRISH COUNCIL BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn."—(*Mr. George Whiteley.*)

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD said that on that Motion he had one or two questions to ask. In the first place, in the long list of measures which the Prime Minister told them last Friday were to be withdrawn, this particular Bill was not mentioned. His hon. friends and himself had been awaiting the Second Reading of it. It was mentioned in the foremost place at the commencement of the session. Why was it withdrawn? Was any pressure brought to bear upon the Government from any section of the House to withdraw the Bill, and was that Bill or any similar Bill to be introduced in some future session? He asked some explanation from those Members of the Government whom he saw still sitting on the Treasury Bench.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY said the right hon. Gentleman must have forgotten that a few weeks or perhaps more ago, the Prime Minister announced that the Bill would be withdrawn. The Bill was being withdrawn because it was not being proceeded with. He had not heard that any pressure had been brought to bear on the Government in the matter. As regarded future years they might perhaps leave them to take care of themselves.

MR. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford) asked on a point of order if the Motion could be accepted unless it was made by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill.

MR SPEAKER said it could.

Question put, and agreed to.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn."

COLONEL LOCKWOOD asked the President of the Board of Education for an explanation why the Bill was to be withdrawn at half-past six in the morning. When the Bill was introduced the Minister for Education made great promises of what would be done by it, and something must have happened to change his opinions regarding it. Members had been elated at the prospect held before them. Perhaps as the Minister for Education was not present the Patronage Secretary would explain. He had no doubt he knew all about it.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY said they had had a complaint because of the withdrawal of the Bill at half-past six in the morning. He thought the complaint would have been better founded if they had proposed to go on with the Bill. If he had not come to an agreement with the right hon. Gentleman's colleagues he would have proposed that they should go on with some other Bills.

Question put, and agreed to.

LOCAL REGISTRATION OF TITLE (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn,

NAVAL LANDS (VOLUNTEERS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

TELEGRAPH (CONSTRUCTION) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) [REMUNERATION].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of the remuneration of any interim Sheriff Substitute appointed in pursuance of any Act of the present session to regulate and amend the laws and practice relating to the civil procedure in Sheriff Courts in Scotland."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

MR. YOUNGER asked whether there was any provision in the Resolution for paying sheriffs' substitutes at an increased rate. The Government was placing a very much larger jurisdiction, and much greater work on them, and their present inadequate salary ought to be increased.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY said that if the hon. Member would put a Question on the Paper he would see that it was answered.

MR. YOUNGER said he would have been glad to have accepted that Answer, but for the fact that when the Financial Resolution of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill was before the House, he asked a similar Question, and was told by the Chairman of Committee that the proper time and place for his inquiry was the Grand Committee. On the Grand Committee the clause was closured without discussion, so he was putting a Question now.

The Resolution was agreed to, and was reported to the House.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported this day.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1905-6.

Committee to consider the Surpluses and Deficits upon Navy and Army Grants for 1905–6, and the application of Surpluses to meet Expenditure not provided for in the grants for that year, this day—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented respectively on the 18th and 20th February last, be referred to the Committee.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Whereupon MR. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of this instant July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes before Seven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 30th July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Tees Conservancy Bill [H.L.]—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Sunderland Corporation Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway (General Powers) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Camperdown be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Brougham and Vaux; and that the Earl of Camperdown be Chairman of the said Committee; read, and agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS, 1906).

Vol. XLI., Part III. Prices and supplies of corn, live stock, and other agricultural produce.

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND), 1906.

Part I. Criminal Statistics.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EARL OF CROMER.

His Majesty's most gracious message of Wednesday last considered (according to Order).

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, it is with great personal gratification that I rise to make the Motion which falls to my lot on this occasion, because it is a Motion tending to recognise the great and eminent services of a Member of this House, Lord Cromer, whom I trust I may count among my most valued friends, with whom I have been associated in office, and to do honour to whom is a great pleasure to myself. Lord Cromer's great services are so well known to your Lordships, and indeed to all his countrymen, that it would be out of place, and I may almost say a waste of time so far as the matter of conviction goes, if I were to describe them at length on this occasion. The great success of Lord Cromer's administration in Egypt has afforded signal justification for that belief, of which we are apt, perhaps, in this country to boast too much, that Englishmen are eminently qualified for the administration of affairs in any part of the world and on behalf of any nation in whose government they may take part. During the twenty-four years which my noble friend as been at the head of the Egyptian Administration he has done work of infinite difficulty and of the highest importance, a work beneficial to the people of that country, bringing order out of chaos, and laying firm and solid the foundations of prosperity in that country, achievements calculated to confer much honour upon the British name. I feel sure that your Lordships will unanimously concur in the Resolution with which I shall conclude my remarks.

Although most of us, here and outside, connect Lord Cromer's name chiefly with the great work he has done in Egypt, it would be a great mistake to suppose that his public services have been confined to that country. Lord Cromer was trained in a good school of administration. He was private secretary to my late lamented friend, Lord Northbrook, the eminent administrator, who was able to train his young secretary in the solid foundations of good administration. Subsequently I had the great advantage of having Lord Cromer as financial member of the Indian Council during the chief part of the time during which I had the honour to fill the office of Viceroy of India, and I was able then to watch from day to day his devotion to duty, his firm grasp of financial principles, and his high administrative ability. It is therefore with no hesitation that I submit to your Lordships this Motion asking you to express to the Sovereign your readiness to concur in doing honour to one who has rendered such services alike to the Crown and to the people of this country.

Recognition such as that which it is intended to offer to Lord Cromer has very generally been confined to members of the naval and military services, but I rejoice that on this occasion we are about to confer a similar honour upon one whose services have been of a civil nature. If a precedent be sought we all know that a grant of the kind now in contemplation was made many years ago to the late Sir Rowland Hill for the great and eminent services which he discharged in connection with postal administration in this country; but if there had been no precedent I should have been glad to have created one on this occasion. I should have been very glad to have taken part in a step whereby the Parliament of this country, like the Crown, was prepared to recognise eminent service to the public weal wherever given, and in whatever branch of the public service they have been discharged.

I am sorry that in this I find against me the high authority of the late Lord Salisbury, who in moving a similar proposal in regard to my noble and gallant friend, Lord Roberts, thus expressed himself —

> "We never depend upon the services of civilians in the sense and to the extent to which we depend on the services of great commanders."

That expression of Lord Salisbury's is no doubt true in a sense, but I think it was stated too broadly; at all events, it was a statement more broad than I individually am inclined to agree with. I think we shall do well if upon this occasion we do not hesitate for a moment to place my noble friend, Lord Cromer, in the same position and on a perfect equality with the eminent soldiers and sailors who have previously been honoured in this manner. I believe, and I do not think your Lordships will be inclined to differ from me, that there have been both in this and other countries statesmen and administrators whose public services have equalled if not surpassed those of many a naval and military commander. In order that we may take our part, humble though it may be, in conferring an honour of this description on a statesman like Lord Cromer, I beg to move that an humble address of thanks and concurrence be presented to his Majesty in answer to his most gracious Message.

Moved, "That an humble address of thanks and concurrence be presented to His Majesty."—(*Marquess of Ripon.*)

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, we on this side of the House do not yield to noble Lords opposite in our appreciation of Lord Cromer's services, and we desire to associate ourselves with all that has been said by the noble Marquess, and to accept our full share of responsibility for the proposal which His Majesty's Government has made. Lord Cromer has, indeed, conferred signal services upon this country and the Empire. I was glad the noble Marquess reminded us that, although we are apt to connect Lord Cromer's name almost exclusively with Egypt, it was not in Egypt alone that he did good work for us. I can well remember the reputation which Lord Cromer left behind him in India as Financial Member of Council. But it is upon Egypt that Lord Cromer has left an indelible mark, and it was the affairs of Egypt which enabled him to write a page in the history of this country which is all his own.

On such occasions as this one is apt to look for a parallel to the case before Parliament, but I really believe there is no case that stands exactly on all fours with that of Lord Cromer. Our position in Egypt is an altogether exceptional one, and Lord Cromer's position in that country was also exceptional. I think it would be almost true to say of him that during his long term of office he was able to serve two masters with equal fidelity and success. Of British interests he was the faithful custodian, and nobody need be reminded of the importance of those interests. It is due to Lord Cromer that our position in that country, at one time undefined and, indeed, somewhat precarious, became assured and consolidated. But if Lord Cromer was a faithful guardian of British interests, he was not the less a faithful guardian of the interests of the country committed to his charge; nothing could have been more wholehearted than his devotion to Egyptian interests. His work, when one comes to review it, was indeed a marvellous achievement in the interests of Egypt. When we consider how under his guidance the great natural resources of that country were developed, when we remember the manner in which he was able to reorganise its financial system and restore its credit, when we remember how every branch of Egyptian administration has during his tenure of office been put upon a sounder footing, we may indeed claim for him that under the guidance of no other man could so much have been done for the people of Egypt. I dare say many of your Lordships may from time to time have perused those admirable Reports which from year to year Lord Cromer was in the habit of submitting to the Foreign Office. I have never read them without a feeling of profound admiration—a feeling that this country might indeed be proud that we had such a man as Lord Cromer to represent us. But although the public generally has been well aware of the magnitude of Lord Cromer's achievements, although it has, so to speak, seen the great output of work of which he was the author, it was reserved for those who were behind the scenes, and who knew the conditions under which that work was performed, to realise in face of what great difficulties and apparently insuperable obstacles that task was so admirably accomplished.

Lord Cromer had to contend with many disappointments; he had to overcome many rivalries; but he triumphed over them all, and he triumphed because he possessed in the highest degree two great qualities, qualities indispensable in a public man—the qualities of tact and tenacity. It would be unjust to Lord Cromer if I did not refer to my conviction that the satisfactory understanding attained by the late Government with the Government of France in regard to many outstanding questions, and notably in regard to Egyptian affairs, would not have been obtainable, or at all events would not have been obtainable on so satisfactory a basis, if it had not been for the exceptional position which Lord Cromer occupied amongst the representatives of the other Great Powers in Egypt. In this House, at any rate, I feel sure that no discordant note will be raised when we consider the proposal put before us by the noble Marquess. We feel that this proposed grant is no excessive reward for great public service. We trust that it may enable Lord Cromer to enjoy the well-earned rest which we hope he will take after labours which it is well known have involved a serious strain upon his health. We trust that he may live long to see others carry out the great work in Egypt which will always be associated with his name.

On Question, Motion agreed to *nemine dissentiente*; the said address to be presented to His Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday next; (The Lord Chancellor). (No. 139.)

COMPANIES (DEBENTURES AND DEBENTURE STOCK) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order.)

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

LORD AVEBURY said the new Clause 2 standing in his name on the Paper, and which he proposed to insert in substitution for the present Clause 2, did not differ in any way substantially from the Clause in the Bill; but there were Amendments which His Majesty's Government wished to introduce, and to which the promoters of the Bill had no objection, and in these circumstances it had been thought best to insert a new clause rather than submit a number of separate Amendments. But in moving the Amendment he wished to leave out the last subsection—subsection (4).

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 2 and to insert the following new clause, viz.: 2.—(1) Where either before or after the passing of this Act a company has redeemed any debentures previously issued, the company, unless the articles of association of the company or the conditions of issue otherwise provide, or unless the debentures have been redeemed in pursuance of any obligation on the company so to do, and not being an obligation enforceable only by the person to whom the redeemed debentures were issued, shall have power, and shall be deemed always to have had power, to keep the debentures alive for the purposes of re-issue, and where a company has purported to exercise such a power the company shall have power, and shall be deemed always to have had power, to re-issue the debentures either by re-issuing the same debentures or by issuing other debentures in their place, and upon such a re-issue the person entitled to the debentures shall have, and shall be deemed always to have had, the same rights and priorities as if the debentures had not previously been issued. (2) Where with the object of keeping debentures alive for the purpose of re-issue they have either before or after the passing of this Act been transferred to a nominee of the company, a transfer from that nominee shall be deemed to be a re-issue for the purposes of this section. (3) Where a company has either before or after the passing of this Act deposited any of its debentures to secure an advance, the debentures shall not be deemed to have been redeemed by reason only of the advance having, whilst the debentures were so deposited, been repaid."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD said he might at a subsequent stage have to ask their Lordships to insert subsection (4) which the noble Lord had deleted from his Amendment as it stood on the Paper. Subsection (4) ran—

"(4) The re-issue of a debenture or the issue of another debenture in its place under this section, whether made before or after the passing of this Act, shall be treated as the issue of a new debenture for the purposes of stamp duty, but it shall not be so treated for the purposes of any provision limiting the amount or number of debentures to be issued:

"Provided that nothing in this section shall prejudice the operation of any judgment or order of a Court of competent jurisdiction pronounced or made before the twenty-sixth day of February, one thousand nine hundred and seven, as between the parties to the proceeding in which the judgment was pronounced or the order made, and any appeal from any such judgment or order shall be decided as if this Act had not been passed.

"Provided also that nothing herein contained shall derogate from or prejudice any power to issue debentures in the place of any debentures paid off or otherwise satisfied or extinguished reserved to a company by its debentures or the securities for the same."

The Inland Revenue were strongly of opinion that if this subsection found no place in the Bill the revenue would lose thereby. In these circumstances he hoped that at the Third Reading stage the noble Lord would himself move the insertion of the subsection, or allow him to move it on behalf of the Government.

LORD AVEBURY said his noble friend was, of course, master of the situation. There were, however, some points which he was anxious to submit for the noble Earl's consideration. He therefore hoped he might be allowed to move the Amendment without subsection (4) at the present moment. They could confer together between that and the next stage of the Bill.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3:—

LORD AVEBURY moved to omit Clause 3—

"Where a company raises money by way of mortgage or charge on the security of debentures or debenture stock, whether issued by such company or by any other company, it shall be lawful for the company to give to the person making such advance and his assigns the option to purchase such debentures or debenture stock or any part thereof, and such option shall be effective."

He was prompted to delete this clause—and he would move a similar Amendment with regard to Clause 4—considering the late period of the Session.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 3."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4:—

LORD AVEBURY then moved to omit Clause 4—

"(4) Wherever there is a breach of contract with a company to take and pay up at a specified price, whether by instalments or otherwise, any debentures or debenture stock of such company, any Court having jurisdiction to award damages for such breach of contract shall also have jurisdiction to order specific performance of such contract as fully as it would have in the case of a contract to take and pay up shares in a company."

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 4."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to, Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 140.)

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved an Amendment to provide that every person who should cause or permit any vehicle to be in any street, highway, or road to which the public had access during the period between one hour after sunset and one hour before sunrise, should provide such vehicle with a lamp or lamps "in proper working order." He understood that in the opinion of those who were responsible for the introduction of this Bill it was the owner who ought to be made responsible and not the driver. He moved the insertion of the words "in proper working order" to make it quite clear that that was the case. For instance, the owner might supply a defective lamp or one without oil or wick. By the Amendment the onus would be on the owner of supplying a lamp in proper working order, and he hoped the noble Earl in charge of the Bill would have no objection to its insertion.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'lamps' to insert the words 'in proper working order and.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said he would accept the Amendment. The Government had a number of Amendments on the Paper, and he hoped their insertion would not make it difficult to get the Bill considered when it went back to the other House. He trusted that they would have the assistance of the Government in avoiding the loss of the Bill.

EARL RUSSELL endorsed the appeal of the noble Earl. He said the Bill had been for months in another place, where these Amendments, which were purely Departmental Amendments, ought to have been introduced. It would be a very unfortunate thing if, through the insertion of the Government's Amendments at this stage, the Bill were lost altogether. He hoped the noble Earl who represented the Home Office would give their Lordships some assurance on the matter.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

EARL BEAUCHAMP said his Amendment to this Clause was in the same direction as the Amendment to which their Lordships had just agreed.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'no' and to insert the words 'if a,' and after the word 'person' to insert the words 'driving or being in charge of a vehicle is.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3:—

LORD AVEBURY moved to amend subsection (1) of Clause 3, so as to give the council of any borough power to exempt any district from the operation of the Act. The Liverpool Chamber of Commerce had written to him on the subject of this Amendment. There were seven miles of road along the quay, and it was well lighted. They were anxious to avoid the requirement of special lights in order to minimise the danger of fire. This was recognised in the Bill, and the Secretary of State was allowed to exempt any vehicle which was carrying inflammable goods. This seemed a cumbersome, and in some cases quite unworkable provision; moreover, the driver often did not know whether his load contained inflammable materials or not. And if he did, how was he to get an order? He did not see what evil could follow from the Amendment. Surely the local authority could be trusted, and the Secretary of State would not give his consent except for good reason.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'any,' to insert the words 'district, or any.'—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE held that the case of Liverpool was already met in the Bill. Under the

Bill the council of any borough might, by order approved by Secretary of State, exempt any vehicle from the operation of the Act; and Subsection (5) provided that—

> "The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board shall as respects the area under their control have the same power to make an order of exemption under this section as the council of a borough have as respects their borough, and the powers of the council of a borough under this section shall not extend to any part of the borough which is situated within that area."

He admitted that Liverpool was a special case requiring special protection, but claimed that this protection had been given in the subsection to which he had referred.

LORD AVEBURY said his Amendment was not designed to give any power to any district, but simply to enable the local authority to exempt any district. What the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce and the Salvage Association desired was that the seven miles of road belonging to the docks, which was already well lighted and in which there was very inflammable produce, should be exempted. No doubt there might be similar cases in other parts of the country, and he thought there was much force in the suggestion that the local authority, with the consent of the Secretary of State, should be allowed to exempt any particular area to which these conditions applied. He would not, however, press his Amendment at the present stage.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the people of Liverpool already had the power, under the subsection to which Lord Donoughmore had referred, of excluding the particular district in question. What Lord Avebury's Amendment proposed was that, not only in the case of Liverpool, but in respect of every district throughout the country, the council of the borough should have power of exemption. That was an Amendment which His Majesty's Government were not prepared to accept, and he hoped the noble Lord would not press it.

EARL RUSSELL thought Lord Avebury could not have considered the effect of Subsection (1) of Clause 3, which provided that the council of any borough might exempt—

The Earl of Donoughmore.

> "Any vehicle which is carrying any inflammable goods of a kind specified in the order, or any vehicle being within any place specified in the order, in which, in the opinion of the council, it would be dangerous to enforce the provisions of the Act owing to the fact that inflammable goods are usually stored or dealt with in or near the place."

That surely covered any vehicle in the road along the quay at Liverpool and met the object of the noble Lord.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS moved the insertion of a new subsection to provide that the council of any county borough might, by order approved by the Secretary of State, exempt from the operation of the Bill any vehicle which was not proceeding faster than a walking pace. He explained that he moved the Amendment on behalf of the Employers' Parliamentary Council and the Liverpool Cart-owners' Association. The Bill enabled lights to be insisted upon everywhere, but there was no object in lights being carried on carts that went slowly through well-lighted towns. His Amendment was, therefore, strictly in accordance with common-sense, and the public safety would in no way suffer. He would also like to see it extended to carts in the country, where the danger was really caused by motorists and others travelling at a high speed rather than by carts going at a walking pace.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 2, line 16, after the word 'place' to insert the following new subsection: '(2) The council of any county borough may, by order approved by the Secretary of State, exempt from the operation of this Act, subject to any conditions mentioned in the order, any vehicle which is not proceeding faster than a walking pace.'"—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

*LORD CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH hoped the Committee would not agree to the Amendment, which appeared to be based upon the fallacy that a vehicle which was moving slowly or not at all was not a source of danger on a dark night. It was agreed that an abandoned cart without a horse left in the middle of the road would be a serious obstruction to traffic, and it seemed to him that a slowly-moving vehicle was almost as great a danger as one which was not moving at all. An argument in favour of the Amendment was that it would only apply to boroughs where the streets were well lighted; but a cart so exempted might very easily get out of the well-lighted locality and become a source of danger.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE entirely agreed with the view expressed by Lord Clifford. This Amendment was moved when the Bill was before the House of Commons Committee, and was rejected by a majority of 29 to 10; and if it were inserted now the Bill would probably be lost owing to disagreement with another place. But on merits he hoped their Lordships would not accept the Amendment, for there could be no doubt that slow-going traffic was just as dangerous as fast-going traffic.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said the Home Office were entirely in accord with the views stated by noble Lords opposite, and he therefore hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD LUDLOW moved an Amendment to give the London County Council within the Administrative County of London the same powers under this section as the council of a borough had within their borough. The words at the beginning of the section were "the council of any borough." This would not include the London County Council, which was the authority in London for explosives; neither would any borough council in the metropolis be included.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 39, after the word 'rate' insert the following new subsection: '(6) The London County Council shall within the Administrative County of London have the same powers under this section as the council of a borough have within their borough, and for the purposes of this section the county fund shall be substituted for the borough fund or rate.'" —(*Lord Ludlow.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said he hesitated to disagree with the noble and learned Lord on a question of law, but he understood that the Bill would include the metropolitan borough councils. The effect of the Amendment would be to make confusion worse confounded, because it would give the London County Council powers which no other county council in the country possessed.

LORD LUDLOW said the London County Council were the authority in London for explosives, and they would be unable to take advantage of the exemption in Clause 3 unless they were included. The metropolitan borough councils had no powers whatever in the matter.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said that one of the main objects of the Bill was to make the law the same throughout the country. The Amendment would give the London County Council powers which no other county council possessed, and for those reasons the Home Office were very unwilling to agree to the Amendment. At the present time the London County Council had powers to make a by-law practically carrying out this section, but, though they had this power, they had never exercised it. As they had not seen fit to exercise it in the past the Home Office did not think it necessary to give them this power in the future.

LORD AVEBURY supported the Amendment and referred to the enormously valuable property in the London docks which it was desirable should be protected from fire. It was quite true that no other county council would have this power, but then no other county council was in the same position. The London County Council in this matter was in the same position as the borough councils throughout the country, and in the interest of fire prevention at the docks it was desirable that the London County Council should have the power suggested in the Amendment.

EARL BEAUCHAMP repeated that the London County Council had had this power in the past, but had not exercised it. Therefore, as they had not thought fit to exercise it in the past, it was not proposed to give them the power in the future.

*VISCOUNT ESHER inquired whether the London County Council would in the future retain the power which it had been said they now possessed.

EARL BEAUCHAMP understood they would not; but the borough councils would be able to exercise the power if they thought it necessary. The local authorities in whose areas the London docks were situated would know more about the circumstances than the County Council, and it would be better to leave the matter to them.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY thought it would be advisable to give these powers to the central authority, as proposed in the Amendment, seeing that there were at least three borough councils in whose districts the docks were situated which might all adopt different methods. Moreover London boroughs were not on the same footing as other boroughs, and the London County Council was really the urban authority for London.

LORD LUDLOW said it was no good including the London borough councils in this clause, because they had absolutely no powers in regard to explosives. The authority for explosives was the London County Council, and that Council should therefore be included.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 3 agreed to.

EARL BEAUCHAMP moved to insert the following new clause:—"The council of any county may by order exempt from the operation of this Act vehicles carrying in the course of harvesting operations any farm produce to stack or barn during such months or periods in the year as may be specified in the order, and any such orders may be made either to take effect throughout the whole county or to take effect in part only of the county." He said this Amendment was introduced in place of Sub-section (*e*) of Clause 4, which exempted from the operation of the Act "any vehicle carrying farm produce to stack or barn during the months of August, September, and October." Farmers would, by this new clause, be able to benefit from the exemption during the hay harvest, as well as during the corn harvest.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 3, to insert the following new clause:

'4. The council of any county may by order exempt from the operation of this Act vehicles carrying in the course of harvesting operations any farm produce to stack or barn during such months or periods in the year as may be specified in the order, and any such orders may be made either to take effect throughout the whole county or to take effect in part only of the county.' "—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said he understood one of the objects of this Bill was that the same law should apply to the whole of the country; but it was obvious that under this clause there would not be uniformity. However, if the House were disposed to accept this Amendment, he would not press his opposition to it.

*LORD CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH said the effect of the Amendment would be that a traveller travelling from county to county or from one part of a county to another would be ignorant whether a cart in that locality was exempted from carrying lights. He thought it would be much better if the Bill could in this matter remain as it stood, so that the months during which this privilege was given should be laid down by Statute and be known by everyone.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said that under the circumstances he would not resist the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4:—

Consequential Amendment, agreed to.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL moved a new sub-section providing that the Act should not apply to Scotland. The Bill in the form in which it originally appeared in the other House contained a clause by which Scotland was exempted from its operations, and in consequence the Bill was not opposed by the Secretary for Scotland during any of its steps there. That clause remained in the Bill until the last moment, and then an Amendment was carried striking it out. It was to reinsert the clause that he now moved his Amendment. The references in the Bill were all to English Acts and to English procedure, and he was afraid that if the House did not agree to the exclusion of Scotland, it would be necessary for him to move a whole series of Amendments at a later stage, in order to make the Bill in any way workable in Scotland.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 37, after the word 'road' to insert the following sub-section: (5) 'This

Act shall not apply to Scotland.'"—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE said he would be unwilling to do anything which would prevent Scottish people killing each other in any way they liked. He therefore accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

LORD DENMAN moved the insertion of a new clause. He explained that without this clause every man, woman, or child in Ireland who had a bicycle would be compelled to carry a lamp on the off-side. Sub-section (1) of Clause 4 provided that——

"This Act shall apply to every sort of vehicle except the following:—

(*a*) Any bicycle, tricycle, or velocipede to which the provisions of section eighty-five of the Local Government Act, 1888, requiring lamps to be carried apply."

The Local Government Act of 1888 did not apply to Ireland, and therefore the provision as to the position of the lamp would apply in Ireland in the case of a bicycle or other similar machine. He did not know whether the off-side of a bicycle could be defined; in any case, there would be considerable difficulty in fixing a lamp to the off-side. One way in which the difficulty could be avoided would be by cyclists carrying two lamps; but as cyclists frequently considered one lamp rather superfluous he did not think that was a provision to which they would agree. It was to prevent an injustice being done to cyclists in Ireland that he moved his Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 4, to insert the following new clause:

"'5. In the application of this Act to Ireland, the Lord Lieutenant shall be substituted for the Secretary of State, and the provision as to the position of the lamp, if only one lamp is provided, shall not apply in the case of a bicycle, tricycle, velocipede, or other similar machine.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE accepted the Amendment, and said he was grateful to the noble Lord for his solicitude for his fellow countrymen.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN thought that what had passed with regard to this Bill should be to some extent a warning to their Lordships as to dealing with Bills of this nature which came up to them proposed by non-official Members in the House of Commons. The measure, they were told, as it now stood, would enact great injustice to cyclists in Ireland, and the Scottish Office said it could not give satisfaction in Scotland. He did not see why English farmers should be less considered than Scottish farmers in this matter, or why those who took a motor or carriage from England to Scotland should be subjected, more in Scotland than in England, to the danger of a loaded wagon which was not lighted. He was afraid the Bill had not been sufficiently considered by the House of Commons. He was told that it slipped through at half-past one in the morning when probably very few Members were in the House, and when neither the representative of the Scottish Office nor of the Irish Office was there.

LORD DENMAN: I think he was.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN said the Bill was then sent up to their Lordships' House in a very imperfect state, by the admission of the noble Lord who had just spoken, and they were expected to pass it practically without Amendment, because if any Amendments were inserted it would be probably lost this session, as no time could be found for its further consideration by the House of Commons. He thought it was rather hard on their Lordships to be placed in such a position, which could certainly not conduce to satisfactory legislation.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Other clauses and preamble agreed to.

Bill re-committed to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 141.)

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD: The Bill I have the honour to ask your Lordships to read a second time is for the purpose of providing a sum of six millions for the construction of telephone trunk lines and London exchanges. The Bill is on the same lines as that passed in 1902, when a vote of one million was provided, and of that in 1904, when there was a sum of three millions provided, and I hope that the sum now voted will carry us on till 1911, when the Post Office acquire the whole of the National Telephone Company. It may be of interest to your Lordships if I state in a few words what was the actual position when in 1892 we took over the telephone trunk service of the National Telephone Company. In those days there were 29,000 miles of trunk wire. This year we own 145,000 miles of trunk wire and if we take into consideration London and the provinces, altogether there are something like 380,000 miles of telephone wires. Last year the telephone account was a very satisfactory one, because after paying 3 per cent. on capital and writing off a certain sum of money for depreciation, etc., we had a total profit of over £37,000. As the noble Marquess opposite is well aware, the telegraph service is not a remunerative one, but as soon as we take over the telephones in 1911, we shall, as at present, run these telephones on a purely business footing. We are not giving facilities unless we can get a certain adequate return on the outlay. I might also mention that in certain parts of the country where we have developed a telephone system in fruit districts, and although we have done so at some slighter percentage of profits than we thought at first was justified, it has paid very well. Under these circumstances I venture to trust that your Lordships will assent to the Second Reading of this Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}. Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Order of the day for Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF GRANARD said: This Bill is another Post Office Bill. As the noble Marquess opposite is well aware, it is to give the Postmaster-General power to acquire lands in certain districts. The Bill has been laid on the Table of this House for some time, and there has been no opposition so far offered to it. The Bill has passed the House of Commons, and I trust your Lordships will give it a Second Reading.

On Question Bill read 2^{a}, and committed for Tuesday next.

SECRECY OF OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS.

*VISCOUNT ESHER had the following Question on the Paper: "To ask the Lord Chancellor whether written communications on official business of State between the Sovereign and members of the Cabinet, the Viceroy of India, and British Ambassadors to Foreign Courts, as well as between members of the Cabinet themselves, are protected under the Official Secrets Act, or are in any way safeguarded against unauthorised publication."

The noble Viscount said: Before putting the Question which stands in my name I should like to say a few words in explanation. Certain literary work in which I have been engaged during the past two years has led me to examine documents which have brought home to me, as I think it would to your Lordships, the grave risks which are run from the unauthorised disclosure of private political papers. I have no wish to exaggerate or to curtail in any way reasonable freedom of authors to write biographies or of the public to read them, nor have I any intention of referring to any specific documents, and I only mention them in order that your Lordships may see that my Question is not based upon theory or conjecture, but upon solid facts, which I must ask your Lordships to take from me are serious enough to warrant it. It must be within the recollection of your Lordships that the tranquillity of Europe has been disturbed before now by an expression or a phrase from some eminent statesman or monarch. I am ashamed to mention so well-known an episode as the famous Berlin telegram of 12th June, 1870, the effect of which was to bring about the war between France and Germany. That proceeding was calculated, and intentionally and carefully designed, as has since appeared, for the specific purpose of bringing about a war between France and Germany. It is not to that species of document that this Question refers. But I want your Lordships to consider whether a similar effect might not be produced by an accidental—to use a comprehensive word—publication of a document which was never intended to see the light. I do not wish to weary your Lordships with illustrations, but I will take two periods within 20 years of each other, when the tension between this country and a great foreign Power was extreme, to explain the object of this Question. We were perhaps never much nearer to a war with our great neighbour across the Channel than after the attempt upon the life of the Emperor of the French, on 14th January, 1858, and nothing but the most guarded language on the part of the statesmen who at that time were responsible for the government of this country saved us from the calamity of a war. So ultra-careful was Lord Palmerston, so pusillanimous was he from the point of view of certain persons, that he was made to pay the penalty commonly exacted from any Minister who fails to respond to the hot fit of the people of this country when they are in a passion, and, as your Lordships will remember, at the first push of his political opponents his Government fell. The question I would ask the noble Lord upon the Woolsack to consider is this: what would have happened at that moment if one of the letters which passed freely between Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon, who was at that time Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, or Lord Cowley, who was Ambassador in Paris, written with the natural want of reserve with which one colleague addresses another, or one of the daily letters which passed between the Sovereign and her Minister, written with all the outspoken frankness which characterised the relations between the Queen and her Ministers, had fallen into the enterprising hands of some newspaper correspondent? And again, I would like to refer to a period 20 years later, to two highly precarious dates in the year 1878, when war between this country and Russia appeared inevitable. On 25th January in that year the late Lord Carnarvon resigned, and on 28th March Lord Derby followed his example. I would leave to your Lordships' imagination the nature of the correspondence which must inevitably have passed in those days—the natural reflections upon the motives of the late Emperor of Russia, upon the attitude of the present Emperor of Austria, and the strong and dangerous light thrown upon the intentions in certain eventualities of the British Government. It only seemed to require an imprudence—a letter left upon a table, or in a railway carriage, a dishonest servant, an unscrupulous editor—and nothing could have averted the calamity of war. This period was specially interesting, because only three months later, the House will recollect, the Anglo-Russian agreement, a secret document of the first importance, was stolen from the Foreign Office and published in an evening paper, and it was mainly this publication which ten years later brought about the passing of the Official Secrets Act through Parliament. But the risks and dangers do not stop there. When Lord Melbourne died correspondence with his Sovereign and his colleagues, known to be of great importance, could not be found for many months. He was accused, quite falsely as it transpired, of having surrendered it into hands thought to be untrustworthy. There is another source of danger. It is quite true that the relatives and executors of deceased statesmen have hitherto shown great care and reserve. But in the last ten years a great change has come about in the ideas of the public as to the time which might properly elapse between the death of a statesman and the publication of his papers. The correspondence between Lord Grey and King William IV. was not published for thirty years after the passage of the Reform Bill, to which it had reference. The correspondence of Sir Robert Peel, who died in 1851, was not published until somewhere about 1881. The "Lives" of Lord Dalhousie, Lord Durham, and Sidney Herbert have only recently been published, and they deal with events half a century old. A relative of my own, who was Belgian Minister in London for many years, and who, owing to the intimate connection between the late King Leopold and her late Majesty Queen Victoria, died in possession of very private documents, left the strictest injunctions that his papers were not even to be examined or touched for thirty years after his death. But that is not the modern practice. I do not complain or suggest criticism, and everyone must have welcomed the admirable biographies of Mr. Gladstone, Lord Randolph Churchill, and Lord Granville, which have appeared in recent years, and which are all of them free, thanks to the political experience as well as to the skill of their authors, from political indiscretions of any kind. But that considerable risk is involved no one who has ever had the onerous duty of preparing important correspondence for publication can doubt. Inexperience, carelessness, the natural love for an exciting episode, quite apart from malignancy and the spirit of mischief, might easily, by the publication of some inconvenient document, create an incident and a complication in the public life of the nation which all men would regret. Your Lordships are aware of the importance attached to a Privy Councillor's oath, and to the mystery which properly surrounds the deliberations of the Cabinet. Does it not seem somewhat inconsistent to attribute so much value to the spoken word, and to safeguard it under specially sacred conditions, and yet at the same time to take no adequate precautions against the risks which invariably attend placing secret and confidential matters upon paper? I am aware of the nature and extent of the laws of copyright. They are, as has been so often demonstrated, wholly inadequate for the purpose I have been indicating to the House. Letters improperly published can be suppressed, but meanwhile the mischief is done. A notable case, which occasioned great pain to a member of your Lordships' House, will be in the minds of many. That was a private misfortune, and private persons have their remedy under the existing law. But what is the remedy of the Sovereign if his trust is abused, and what is the remedy of the nation if its highest interests are jeopardised? If there is no remedy under the law as it stands, I would like the Lord Chancellor to consider whether, as the necessity was admitted in 1888, when the Official Secrets Act was passed, to protect by heavy penalties printed documents of State, similar protection should not be extended to the correspondence of those persons mentioned in my Question.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I anticipated that I would have to answer a dry question of law, but the noble Viscount has certainly made a most interesting statement, and one touching upon questions of the very highest public importance. If he will permit me, I will first answer the Question on the Paper which relates to the law as it is, and will afterwards make a few observations in regard to other interesting subjects which the noble Lord dealt with. The documents specified in the Question have no protection beyond that which is extended to ordinary private letters, except in so far as the Official Secrets Act affects them. The protection extended to ordinary private letters is that arising from the law of copyright, which leaves in the writer of the letter, or it may be in his employer or official superior, the property in the letter itself, and enables him to ask for the protection of a Court of law to prevent its publication against his will. There is a right of secrecy in an ordinary private letter which would be protected as a right of property in the Courts. It is quite manifest that for all the purposes indicated by the noble Viscount the law of copyright is wholly inadequate to afford any shelter. Then comes the Official Secrets Act. It is not an Act of Parliament which I should hold up as an example of skilful or even accurate drafting—I was almost going to say that I would scarcely admit its title to grammatical accuracy. The Official Secrets Act affects documents of the kind in two ways. In the first place certain documents cannot be made public when they have relation to fortresses, arsenals, factories, dockyards and camps; but that is a very limited protection. The Act also provides that a person who has obtained documents by means of his holding office under the Crown, or as a contractor under an obligation of secrecy, can be prosecuted if the communication of these documents is against public interest, and the person discloses them corruptly or contrary to his official duties. That also is a very limited protection, and is practically unavailable in the cases suggested by the noble Viscount. Therefore I am obliged to say that under the law as it at present exists the dangers which have been pointed out by the noble Viscount do exist, and are not adequately precluded by any existing law in the degree of their importance and of the risk attaching to their publication. My noble friend has indicated the kind of dangers which might arise. The statement in substance amounted to this, that at a time when public feeling is inflamed there may be most disastrous results from the undue or careless publication of some State documents. Well, I think that is so. No doubt very great discretion has been observed ordinarily by public men and by the Press. Indeed, it is wonderful to me that important documents which come from Departments or are used in the Cabinet are not more frequently disclosed. Of course in some crises of history their disclosure might be followed by the most serious consequences. I am bound to say, and I do not see why we should not say it, or why we should be afraid to say it, that some of the recent developments of a section of the Press of this country do not hold out the expectation that there will be the same reserve or the same fairness in the future as generally there has been in the past. For my own part, I believe it is well worthy of our consideration whether some further safeguard should be imposed, without in the slightest degree restricting any honest freedom—such honest, patriotic freedom as I feel sure would be fairly exercised by the great majority of the Press of this country. This is a subject on which it would be highly improper for me to pronounce any opinion without consideration by myself and by others; but I think there is a good deal of ground for taking into consideration the very important subject which has been raised in so interesting a way by my noble friend.

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE AND THE NAVY.

*LORD BRASSEY said: In bringing very briefly under the consideration of your Lordships the discussion at the Colonial Conference relating to maritime defence, I once more take the opportunity of expressing full confidence in the administration of the Navy in all its leading features. As to ships, manning, and training, we have at no time during my recollection—and I look back across the years—stood so well as we do to-day. There must always be occasion for suggestion or criticism. With regard to maritime defence, the result of the recent deliberations at the Colonial Conference was disappointing. The Premiers came to the Conference desiring to assume a larger share of the Imperial expenditure on the Navy. The Colonies have taken a first step by the enrolment of Naval Reserves. And they have taken that step at the instance of the Admiralty. At the Conference of 1902, the enrolment of Colonial Naval Reserves was strongly urged by Lord Selborne. I may quote from his speech—

> "I want the Colonial Governments to regard the Navy as their own, at least as much as ours, and with that object I wish to see in the Navy more Colonial officers and a contribution of Colonial seamen. I want, in fact, if I may use such a term, to increase the maritime spirit of the Empire. After all, we are not in this country all sailors, yet we are all imbued with the maritime spirit. Here you have the great Colonies covering vast geographical tracts of country. Is there not a danger that in the far interior, unless we take precautions, the maritime spirit may be lost?"

The appeal of Lord Selborne fell upon attending ears. The Colonial Governments called for volunteers, and the call has been answered with enthusiam by our fellow-subjects across the sea. Naval Reserve men have been enrolled in considerable numbers in Australia, Newfoundland, and Malta. A beginning has been made in South Africa. In his Memorandum on the Navy Estimates of the current year my noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty bore testimony to the quality of the Colonial Naval Reserves. He had himself inspected 120 men from Newfoundland, during their visit to the port of London. A most favourable impression was created by their general appearance. In raising men for the Reserves, and in providing for their shore training, the Colonies have done their part. At the Conference, the Premiers asked the aid of the Admiralty to complete the work of training by the loan of suitable vessels. These reasonable demands of the Colonies were not complied with. The policy of the Admiralty in relation to the Naval Reserves generally has changed. My noble friend said in effect that the Navy was already over-manned, and that Reserves were no longer needed. If we compare our numbers with those of foreign Powers the Admiralty may truly say the Navy is over-manned. The reduction, to be gradually made, should not fall wholly on the Reserves. It is the permanent force which has been increased beyond our needs, and at burdensome cost to the taxpayer. At the Conference my noble friend rightly insisted that all the higher ratings—in the engine room, in gunnery, and in the torpedo service—required a training of at least six years. These highly trained men are a limited proportion of the crews.

All foreign navies fill up complements with Reserves. In dealing with the Reserve forces for the Navy we cannot put out of view the fact that the mercantile marine has ceased to be a nursery for seamen, as in the old days. If the supply of seafaring men is falling short at home, it becomes the more desirable to encourage the Colonies to help us. This we can do by the loan of vessels which we are well able to spare, suitable for the training of seamen.

I turn to another point of view. Cruisers are needed in Australian waters, not only for the training of seamen, but for the protection of trade. In an able report by a Committee of naval officers of the Commonwealth, which was laid before the Conference, the over-sea and inter-state imports and exports of Australia are valued at £170,000,000 a year. The officers urge that a local naval force is required for the protection of this important trade. War operations might at any time require the service of the Imperial Squadron at a distance from Australia. Another report on Colonial maritime defence was laid before the recent Conference. I refer to that of the Committee on Imperial Defence. They took a different view from that put forward by the naval officers of the Commonwealth. They recommended that the defensive preparations of our Colonial fellow-subjects should be directed rather to the protection of harbours and the development of military forces. The Committee of Australian Naval Officers dissented from those views. The vast distances, the sparse population, the insufficiency of railway communication, make it impossible to mass troops to meet any possible invasion, and the lines of communication along the coast are of great length. Mr. Balfour's observations in the House of Commons in May, 1905, are appropriately quoted. Dealing with the contingency of the Fleet—that is to say, the Mediterranean Fleet—the Atlantic Fleet, and the Home Fleet, being away from the British shores, Mr. Balfour felt it necessary to give the assurance that England would not be left in maritime helplessness. He enumerated the strong force of battleships and cruisers, the torpedo flotilla and the submarines, which would always remain in home waters. The contention is surely not unreasonable that the same means of local defence which are necessary for the homeland are desirable for Australia. The naval force available should include vessels capable of holding their own in the fierce winds and long seas which sweep the Australian shores. Sea-going destroyers may be useful. Large cruisers are essential. It is beyond the present resources of Australia to provide such vessels. The mother-country can supply them.

A Return has recently been presented to Parliament, on the motion of Lord Cawdor, giving the strength of our own and foreign navies in battleships and armoured cruisers. The comparison shows our overwhelming superiority. And the list officially presented to Parliament does not include six cruisers of the most powerful type, which are near completion, nor does it include more than eighty cruisers on the Navy list, many of which are not obsolete, or even obsolescent, for the protection of trade in distant waters. There are other ships, not suitable perhaps for the protection of Australian trade, but well fitted for the training of reserve men. From this long list, some vessels, I submit, might be handed over to the Commonwealth.

In helping the Colonies by the loan or gift of a few cruisers we shall incur no new expense. We are bound to build up to the two-Power standard. In shipbuilding, invention will never cease. As new ships are completed, the older ships pass out of commission. They should be sent to Australian and other Colonial ports. They would do service for the training of seamen, and would give security to Australian trade.

There was another proposal before the Conference, of the first importance, indirectly connected with maritime defence, as to which I need not address any observations to your Lordships. I refer to what is popularly known as the "all-red" route. It is satisfactory to know that this proposal is under consideration. We have the assurance of the Government that they favour a liberal policy. Fast ocean services expand trade and promote intercourse. It is certain that swift communications are a bond of Empire not open to criticism from any point of view.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, I think the whole House will agree that there is no person here who is more fitted to give an opinion with regard to the Colonial naval defences than my noble friend who has just sat down; he is an expert navigator and seaman; he is the owner of a world-famed yacht; he has discharged high duties in the office of the Admiralty; and he has been Govenor of a great Australian Colony; so that he ought to be in a very good position to express an important opinion on this subject, and I am sorry that my noble friend seems to think that the result of the Colonial Conference this year, so far as naval defence is concerned, was not altogether satisfactory. I thought myself that we had gone a long way in coming to an understanding with the Colonial Premiers on this subject. The question is a very important one, and one that has caused a great deal of anxiety to myself and to the Board of Admiralty to which I belong. It is an intricate and difficult, as well as an important question, as the King's Dominions beyond the seas are very scattered and have various wants. They have various ideas of what is best for themselves, and there is, in fact, very little homogeneity to be found among them. Still, I believe there is a solid basis on which we can found a scheme for joint Imperial naval defence; it can be summed up in six words—"One Empire, one sea, one Navy." I do not think any scheme can be worked that does not acknowledge the supremacy of the great Navy of this country, and that our great Navy must defend our Colonies as well as ourselves; at the same time, a great deal can be done by the Colonies to help us and to help themselves. That was the basis on which I endeavoured to discuss the subject with the Colonial Premiers.

I think it is perhaps desirable that I should state very shortly the exact position in which we stand. In 1887, when Lord George Hamilton was First Lord of the Admiralty, this question of help from the Colonies was first raised, and a certain amount of progress was then made. At the time of the Colonial Conference of 1892, Lord Selborne, who was first Lord of the Admiralty, and Mr. Chamberlain, who was Colonial Secretary, both pressed very hard for increased help from the Colonies, and especially pressed for it to be done by way of subsidy. In consequence of the Conference of 1892 an arrangement was come to with the Australian Colonies for ten years, until 1913. By that agreement Australia was pledged to give £200,000 a year to this country, and New Zealand was similarly pledged to give £40,000 a year, on condition that a certain squadron should be kept in Australian waters. That agreement is still in effect, and cannot be broken without the vote of the Australian and New Zealand Parliaments, as well as of our own. The annual cost of that squadron is £581,954. With regard to South Africa, also, there is an arrangement by which Cape Colony gave £50,000 and Natal £35,000 to the old country. A squadron has been kept there, but there is no special time mentioned for that arrangement to last. The squadron at the Cape costs us £155,355, and we have spent out of the Naval Works Loan Account no less than £2,104,076 for harbour works at Simon's Bay. Of course, in the event of war South Africa would become a centre of our general connection with the East and with the South. These are considerable sums which are charged to us annually, and it is not fair to say that we have shown ourselves in the past at all neglectful of the interests of the Colonies. The case of Newfoundland is different, because there we have no agreement with regard to ships, but only that a certain number of Naval Reserve men should be raised and trained, and this is done to a large extent on ships which go to Newfoundland from this country. These men are, as the noble Lord said, extremely good sailors. Newfoundland pays £3,000 as a subsidy. The case of Canada, too, is totally different. The Canadians have always refused to give anything by way of subsidy, and at the Conference the Canadians, as a set-off, and as showing that they were willing to help the general naval interests of the Empire, talked about the protection they gave to the fisheries on the Labrador coast, the work they did in the great lakes inland, and the fact that they took over the works at Halifax and Esquimalt as involving a considerable relief to the Imperial funds. The cost of the establishment at Halifax had been £31,600, and at Esquimalt £27,300 a year. Providing the Canadians keep up these two docks and harbours in a proper condition they will be doing a very great service to the Empire at large.

I am sorry, however, the Canadian Government do not see their way to give more direct help to the naval defence of the Empire, but with regard to these defensive questions they have their own ideas and views, and I thought the line we ought to take towards the Colonies is that it must be very much a matter for them to decide in what way they are to help the Imperial Government in the matter.

His Majesty's Government have made no change, and proposed no change, with regard to the agreements made with the different Colonial Governments. What we do say is that we want to get as much help as we can from the Colonies, and to take that help in such a way as would be most convenient and useful to the Colonies as well as to the Imperial Government. His Majesty's Government said they would like more substantial help, and questions were discussed as to how that could be given. The Australians, by the mouth of Mr. Deakin—I do not take all that he said as the absolute opinion of the whole of Australia—put forward very strongly their desire for the establishment of something in the nature of an Australian Fleet. The Admiralty raised no objection to that. They only pointed out that they thought, to start with, the best defence they could have was to establish a flotilla of destroyers and submarines. That would form a very substantial defence against any casual raid, and in the event of a war a flotilla of well-manned destroyers and submarines would be of the greatest possible assistance to a British Fleet which had to operate in those waters. The smaller class of vessels cannot be taken over the ocean, and they would be of great advantage in defending those particular Colonies. Of course, during peace-time, they would be entirely under the control of the Colony who adopted them, but in war-time, we insisted that, if we had to send out a big Fleet, the flotilla of destroyers and submarines should be attached to it, and be under the command of the British admiral. That is a plan which involves the assent of the Colonial Parliament and of the Imperial Parliament. I think the various discussions we had brought us nearer to agreement, and before long I hope an agreement will be arrived at. As to New Zealand, that Colony has preferred to adhere to a subsidy. Since the Conference I have heard that the New Zealand people are to raise their subsidy from £40,000 to £100,000, but they do not altogether refuse the idea of having also a submarine or destroyer flotilla as part of the subsidy, or instead of the subsidy altogether if they found that the cost of it was greater than the amount of the subsidy. South Africa is inclined to increase the number of its naval volunteers and to include their training. There are three different sets of Volunteers in South Africa—at Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, and Natal. The suggestion made to Cape Colony and Natal was that they should join up their three different companies, and that one ship should go from one to the other station to train the Volunteers at each place. I do not at all think that is an impossible arrangement to arrive at. In the first place, however, Acts of Parliament have to be passed in the Colonies themselves in order that we may put the Naval Volunteers there on a footing of Royal Naval Volunteers, and those Acts have to be sanctioned here. There, again, there is no desire to reduce the amount of help to be given to the Imperial Government below the cost of the subsidy now given, but there is a desire possibly to take a portion of the subsidy now paid to the Imperial Government for the purpose of carrying out some sort of naval defence in the Colonies themselves.

Then Lord Brassey raised a question about men and Reserves. His argument was that, if at any time the active service ratings and Reserves of the Navy aggregated a larger number than were estimated to be required, the consequent reduction in numbers should be shared by the active service men and the Reserve. He argued that in the last nine years the number on active service ratings had increased from 97,000 to 129,000. It is now 128,000. It is perfectly true that foreign navies largely depend upon Reservists to man their navies. But the position of foreign countries is totally different from our own. We depend upon our Navy as our first line of defence, and to preserve the safety and the prosperity of our country. We cannot afford to wait for the mobilisation of our Reserves. We must, if we want to bring our fleet on to the sea and into operation, have it ready to go to sea at once fully manned and fit to meet the emergencies which it will be called upon to meet. The recent policy of the Admiralty has been to perfect the machinery for mobilising the fleet, and the position we now hold in that respect is very different from that of the time my noble friend remembers when he was at the Admiralty; indeed, the number of men in the Navy are carefully estimated for on the principle that Reserves, though available, cannot be counted on as instantly available on mobilisation. The Navy cannot afford to wait; it must be in a position to man its striking force at once. To keep up this high standard it is necessary to have your men ready at hand to man their ships at a particularly short notice, and for that reason it is not desirable to trust to Reserve men to meet such emergencies. It must not be assumed that our Reserves are being reduced below a very considerable number. We have in the first place established a comparatively new Fleet Reserve, called the Royal Fleet Reserve, which consists of men who are engaged on a comparatively short time of service. The men serve five years on board ship, and for seven years they are in the Reserve, and ready at any moment to come up for mobilisation. There were on 1st January last 16,222 men with the Royal Fleet Reserve, and in the Royal Naval Reserve 21,167 men. The full number in the Royal Fleet and the Royal Naval Reserve on 1st January, therefore, was 43,389 men, besides the 128,000 men on the active list who are ready at any short notice to come on board if they are not on board ship at the time. Then another important Reserve has been established in the class of Royal Naval Volunteers. We had on 1st January 1907, 3,735 of these Naval Volunteers. They are situated in six places, viz., the Clyde, the Tyne, the Mersey, the Thames, the south coast of Sussex, and in the Severn. I do not think it is possible to speak too highly of the class of men who come in with the Naval Volunteers. As you see, they are all at big seaport places, places where shipbuilding goes on, and you get Naval Volunteers made up almost entirely of workmen in such works as Armstrong's on the Tyne. You get a lot of expert men, mechanics, shipwrights, engineers, and so forth—the very men you want at a time of emergency, men who can give the sort of work so very necessary on modern battleships in time of war to keep things right. I think from the point of view of *personnel* we are really extremely well off. I know the Admiralty is accused of paying too much attention to material and not enough to *personnel*. I do not think it is a true criticism of the present policy. I think our *personnel* has been exceptionally well cared for, is exceptionally well trained, and will be found extraordinarily effective if it is called upon.

There was one more point my noble friend alluded to. It is the question of sending our cruisers to the Colonies instead of dealing with them in other ways. I am not myself very much attached to sending odd ships off to odd places in all parts of the world. I believe the very essence of modern policy is to concentrate your fleets as much as possible. I think, however, I may just hint to the House that we have in our minds a new and extended cruiser construction policy, which we shall bring forward in the next or following year. After all, the cruiser is the ship with which eventually we keep our dominance over the sea. The battleships are really only sort of policemen which keep the ring. The cruisers are the *antennæ* of the fleet who bring the news to the battleships. The battleships keep the sea free; it is their business to destroy the fleets of the enemy and to leave the sea free for our cruisers to safeguard our own commerce and to interfere as much as possible with that of our enemies. I hope, my Lords, I have fairly well stated what is the present view of the Admiralty, and that my noble friend will think the answer I have given is a sufficient one.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I listened very carefully as I wished to hear the conditions connected with the grant Australia is going to give towards our Fleet. I did not gather what they all are. I think that some of them were not mentioned by the noble Lord, and I only rise to say it would be advantageous if he would issue some paper or document stating what those conditions are. Regarding the protection of Australia, all there is any chance of any European Power sending out there until she has smashed up our Fleet is an occasional cruiser, and the best way to impede her is to keep torpedo boats available somewhere on that station. Every cruiser at some time or other has to put into harbour for repairs, and, if she knows that a torpedo boat is in the neighbourhood, she cannot act in the same way as if she knew the coast were clear. If the commander knows there is a torpedo boat about he has to keep a number of his men at the guns all night, and to keep the spaces round those guns clear so that he can work them. Men who spend half the night at their guns cannot work full hours at repairs. That will impede the ship, and, instead of the repairs taking a week, they will take a fortnight. During the extra week the cruiser will be doing no mischief, and our own cruisers will hear of her and be able to come up and engage her. There should be local defences in New Zealand and Australia, the officers and men should be kept together and worked together so as to give them training, and there should be competition of one ship against another, and then they could be afterwards dispersed if necessary. The Australian reserves certainly would not arrive in time for any decisive contest that might take place in our waters. But I think it would be a good thing to have more local reserves to fall back upon to fill up vacancies and repair our ships in cases of a long war. We might easily spare, I should think, some of the vessels mentioned by the noble Lord, and the Percy Scott system of teaching the men how to fire is not expensive. It is very desirable to have electricians and mechanics of various descriptions in the reserve ready to assist in the repairs of our own vessels. I hope the noble Earl will be able to give some further information about the conditions of the Australian grant.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND).

LORD EVERSLEY: I beg to ask the noble Lord the President of the Council the Question standing in my name, viz.:—"Whether the Government will supplement the information promised to the Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Doughnomore*) as to the persons who will be entitled to claim under the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, by obtaining from the Estates Commissioners fuller details as to the three estates referred to in their recent Report, as bought for the purpose of reinstating former tenants, showing the terms of reinstatement, the amount of the new rents or annual payments as compared with the former rents, the amounts paid for rebuilding or repairing the buildings and for stocking the farms, and the compensation paid to persons for giving up the holdings."

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): I understand the Question which my noble friend has asked refers to three estates named in the Report, viz., the Ponsonby, the Luggacurran, and the Coolgreaney estates. That is how we read the Question he has put on the Paper. I have to say, in reply, that the Estates Commissioners will be happy, so far as practicable, to give my noble friend the information for which he asks.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I would only like to express a hope that this will not delay the production of the Return. We are anxious to see this Return before the Bill is read a second time. I am sure all my noble friends will be glad to see these figures, and we are indebted to the noble Lord for asking for them. I hope that in the course of a day or two we shall see the beginning of the Return.

LORD ASHBOURNE: I understand that the first Return will be presented at the earliest possible date, and the Return asked for just now by Lord Eversley will be given later.

THE COURSE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I rise for the purpose of asking the noble Marquess the question which appears on the Paper in my name, viz.:—"With reference to the statement made on the 26th instant by the Prime Minister, as to the course of Parliamentary business, whether the Lord Privy Seal will give this House any information, and, if so, when, in regard to the dates at which the measures which His Majesty's Government hope to pass into law during the present session will probably come before this House, and approximately the number of days which, in his estimation, will be sufficient for the discussion of the more important of those measures."

I hope the noble Marquess will not think my curiosity is excessive, but the matter is really one which very deeply concerns your Lordships' House. The Prime Minister has recently made a statement as to the course of business. He has set Parliament a task which I am sure the noble Marquess will not deny is one of extraordinary difficulty and magnitude. He has intimated that the session may be expected to end on 24th August, and he apologised for prolonging it to so unusual a length. The Prime Minister named no less than twenty-three Bills which in his anticipation Parliament might be able to pass within that limit of time. It is perfectly clear that this statement involves both Houses of Parliament, and my object in raising the question this evening is to ascertain on what data that part of the calculation which has reference to your Lordships' House was arrived at. I will not suggest that in making that calculation the Prime Minister for a moment forgot the existence of this House. The Prime Minister is not apt to forget the existence of this House. This House is in his mind a kind of a spectre which apparently haunts him on all possible occasions. I therefore dismiss that hypothesis. I also dismiss another hypothesis, which is that the Prime Minister could have made his statement without first conferring with the noble Marquess and the noble Earl who sits beside him. If the statement had been made without such previous consultation both noble Lords would have had serious reason to complain of the discourtesy with which they were treated. Therefore I must assume that the noble Lords on the opposite bench were consulted by the Prime Minister, aud that the result of those consultations was that the time during the remainder of the session was mapped out between the two Houses. I want to know how our time was mapped out. Of course, mapping out the time of the House of Commons is a comparatively simple task, because we all know the methods by which in that House time can be allocated to particular portions of public business. But those methods, I think, fortunately, do not prevail here, and therefore there must have been on the part of the noble Lords, and who must have advised the Prime Minister on this occasion, some intelligent anticipation of the course of events in this House. I want, with great respect, to ask what the nature of that anticipation was.

The position is really a very serious one. I am given to understand that we are likely to have the Second Reading of the Evicted Tenants Bill on an early date next week—I think Tuesday. Unless I have altogether miscalculated the time at our disposal, I am under the impression that, even if we sit on Fridays, that leaves us about fourteen working days in which to get through the vast accumulation of business which at this moment lies before Parliament. I ask your Lordships to recollect that within that limited time we shall have to dispose of the Evicted Tenants Bill, of the English Small Holdings Bill, of the Scottish Small Holdings Bill, and of the Scottish Valuation Bill, besides a whole series of other Bills, not perhaps of the same importance, but still in many cases requiring examination.

LORD ASHBOURNE: The Criminal Appeal Bill.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My noble friend behind me reminds me that I have left out a very important measure, the Criminal Appeal Bill, which has already been discussed in previous years in this House, and in regard to which many noble and learned Lords undoubtedly would desire to express their opinions. I venture to say that in the face of those facts some explanation is due to your Lordships' House. I suggest that if the noble Marquess really does hope within anything like the limits of time indicated by the Prime Minister to make any approach to a satisfactory progress with all these Bills it would be far better that he should take this House into his confidence and tell us now, or at any rate as soon as possible, what his general idea is as to the time which might be devoted, at any rate, to the most important of the measures of which I have spoken.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The MARQUESS of RIPON): My noble friend who has just sat down has based most of his observations upon a belief that I have consulted and discussed with the Prime Minister the course of proceedings in this House during the rest of the session, and that the speech made by my right hon.

friend on Friday last was the result of consultations of that kind. I am sorry to tell my noble friend that he is mistaken in that idea. I have, unfortunately, been obliged to be absent from this House on account of questions of health, and I did not return to London till Saturday last. Therefore my friend has raised up an imaginary consultation with the Prime Minister.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My imaginary consultation did not include my friend the noble Marquess.

*The MARQUESS OF RIPON: My answer applies only to myself. I know nothing beyond that I was not here at the time. I am obliged to my noble friend for giving me an opportunity of saying it. I feel I owe an apology to this House for my absence. [Noble Lords: No, no.] I should not have left unless I had found it necessary, and I hope your Lordships will excuse me for having taken that leave. My noble friend evidently, from his Question, does not expect any detailed information at the present time, because he says "I will ask the Lord Privy Seal if he will give this House any information, and, if so, when." When he put that Question down, he evidently felt that I could not at this moment have any fresh information to give to this House beyond that given to the public by my right hon. friend on Friday last. That is the case. I feel very strongly that my right hon. friend is perfectly justified in asking for the earliest possible information with respect to the prospects of the present session. I do not deny at all that, as far as this House is concerned, those prospects do not appear altogether satisfactory, but I shall be in a much better position before long, I hope, to give a statement as to the prospects of proceedings of Bills in the House of Commons than I can be in at the present moment. I must now rest my answer upon the speech made by my right hon. friend on Friday last. I quite agree that the number of Bills of which he spoke is a very formidable list. Some of them, I also agree, are measures of very great importance, but I can assure my noble friend that every effort will be made to bring those Bills up to this House at the earliest possible date. One of the Bills mentioned especially —the Crimininal Appeal Bill—I believe passed its Third Reading last night or rather this morning and will therefore come up to this House immediately. The clerks at the Table inform me that it has come up and been read a first time in this House. I cannot at the present moment enter into more details with regard to the prospects of the other measures, but I will at a later date when I am able to speak with more certainty of what those prospects are. I will endeavour, if I can, to make a statement to my noble friend in regard to the whole of those prospects.

When I look to the last part of the Question as it stands upon the Paper, I confess that I am filled with considerable surprise. My noble friend asks me to tell him approximately the number of days which in my estimation will be sufficient for the discussion of the more important of these measures. My Lords, how can I give my noble friend any information upon the subject? It does not rest with His Majesty's Government, it rests with the noble Lord opposite—my noble friend himself is the Leader of the vast legions in this House who settle the length of time discussion takes and the course which is to be followed. If we are able in any degree to regulate the proceedings in this House in that sort of manner, it is only due to the courtesy and the good feeling of the Opposition which is so powerful and which we have to face. It is for my noble friend to say what time he will require for the discussion of these Bills. I cannot say how long they will take. He must therefore excuse me if I do not undertake now and if I do not hold out any prospect of being able to undertake at a later period to answer that part of his Question. No doubt the position this session is one of which your Lordships—I admit it—have a right to complain, but I can only say, although August 24th may seem to be a very late date for the prorogation of Parliament, nevertheless I have in my experience known sessions which have lasted later than that under very different circumstances and with very different difficulties to encounter. I can only hope that your Lordships will be prepared to give to those measures, when they do come up and as soon as they come up, the fullest consideration you can. We will be prepared to afford every possible facility for that purpose, but I cannot undertake to prophesy what may be the course which the majority of this House may think fit to pursue in regard to the discussion of those Bills.

LORD NEWTON: I venture to ask whether it is really the case that nobody upon the Front Bench has been consulted at all with reference to the disposal of the remainder of the time of the session. The noble Marquess is not the only representative of the Government on that bench; there are other noble Lords upon it who surely are qualified in every way for a consultation of this nature. The noble Lord who has just spoken has given utterance to certainly the most modest expressions that I have ever listened to either in this House or another place. He has assumed almost the position of a nonentity and thrown himself, so to speak, upon the mercy of the Opposition. As I have said, I have never heard an announcement of such a modest character made before, but in view of the treatment with which he has evidently been subjected by the head of the Government perhaps it is not altogether so surprising as it ought to be.

FATAL ACCIDENTS (DAMAGES) BILL [H.L.].

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, before your Lordships adjourn, I ask leave to present a Bill dealing with the law of damages recoverable in cases of fatal accidents. Your Lordships will not desire me to explain the scope of this Bill on this occasion; but the law in respect of damages differs in cases of fatal and non-fatal accidents, and the purpose of the Bill is to assimilate it.

FATAL ACCIDENTS (DAMAGES) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law with respect to the assessment of damages under the Fatal Accidents Act—Was presented by the Lord Courtney of Penwith; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Monday next. (No. 142.)

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter past
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 30th July, 1907.

The House met at a Quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Aberdeen Corporation Electricity Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Midland Railway Bill [Lords]; Portishead District Water Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords] (by Order). Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Reported without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time Tomorrow.

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill, as amended, to be considered Tomorrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered Tomorrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered Tomorrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill, without Amendment.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill. Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Sheffield Corporation Bill [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bills [Lords]; Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill [Lords]; Humber Conservancy Bill [Lords].

Amendment to — Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [Lords]; without Amendment.

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Mr. ARTHUR STANLEY reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills. That, for the convenience of parties the Committee had adjourned until Saturday, at half-past Ten of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITION.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Rhynie, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Three Petitions from Reading, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

VACCINATION ACTS.

Petition from Derby, for repeal; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petition from Pirbright, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CLOSING ORDERS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 2nd May; Mr. Crooks]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 277.]

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Agricultural Statistics, 1906. Vol. XLI. Part III. Prices and Supplies of Corn, Live Stock, and other Agricultural Produce [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CRIMINAL AND JUDICIAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland for the year 1906. Part I. Criminal Statistics [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 2) BILL [LORDS.]

Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Regulation of Shipbuilding Work.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty in how many cases during the last five years has the completion of a ship been delayed by the Admiralty in order to prevent undue fluctuation of work in the building yard.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The only case during the last five years is that of the "Defence."

The Slave Trade in Central Africa.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that slave labour recruited in West Africa is largely employed on the islands of St. Thomé and Principé; whether the Portuguese Government has undertaken to put down the slave trade in her West African territory; whether England in 1830 paid a large sum of money to Portugal to secure that suppression; whether Great Britain, in concert with other Powers, has bound herself, by the Ashburton Treaty in 1842, by the Berlin General Act in 1855, and by the Brussels General Act in 1890, to suppress every kind of slave trade in the interior of Africa; and why are these solemn undertakings ignored.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I am aware that the labour in San Thomé and Principé is largely recruited in Portuguese West Africa. There is no trace of any payment having been made to Portugal in 1830 for the suppression of the slave trade in West Africa. But in 1815, by the Convention of the 21st January, a sum of £300,000 was paid to Portugal in discharge of claims for Portuguese ships detained by British cruisers previously to the 1st June, 1814, on the ground that they were engaged in illegal slave trade. And on the 22nd January of the same year a treaty was concluded with Portugal by which the Portuguese slave trade in all parts of Africa north of the Equator was declared to be thenceforward illegal. In this treaty Portugal also engaged to "determine by a subsequent treaty the period at which the Portuguese slave trade should cease universally." Great Britain, on her side, remitted in favour of Portugal the whole of what remained, amounting to £480,000, due to Great Britain out of a loan of £600,000 raised in 1809 for the service of Portugal. The articles of the Ashburton Treaty referred to are Articles VIII. and IX., of which Article VIII. relates to the maintenance, co-operation, etc., of British and United States squadrons off the coast of Africa; and Article IX. arranges for the address of remonstrances to Powers within whose dominions slave markets exist. But these articles do not refer to the slave trade in the interior of Africa. By the Berlin Act of 1885 and the Brussels Act of 1890 the Powers undertook the suppression of slave markets and the slave trade in their territories in Africa. As the hon. Member is aware, His Majesty's Government are prepared to communicate to the Portuguese Government any authentic information which is at their disposal tending to show that anything in the nature of slavery exists in these parts

Reductions, Remissions, etc., in the Rawal Pindi District.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether any and, if any, what reduction, remission, or suspension of land revenue has been made this year in the Rawal Pindi district of the Punjab, in which district recent enhancements of land tax has caused great discontent.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the information which I gave with regard to the Rawal Pindi district in my Answer to a similar Question on the 16th July.† The local Government will set right any cases of over-assessment which may come to light. I do not think that the agricultural circumstances of the district necessitate exceptional measures for remitting or suspending the land revenue. Rules are in force in all districts of the province for the grant of remissions and suspensions in cases of failure of the crops.

Land Taxation in India.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: To ask the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been drawn to the increase last year in evictions in the districts of the Bombay Presidency for non-payment of land revenue, and to the statement of the Hon. Sir Pherozeshah Mehta in the Bombay Legislative Council last month that the unrest in that province was due to the oppressive way in which the Bombay revenue system had been worked for years; and whether, having regard to the warning of John, Lord Lawrence, that we must lose India if the agricultural population become our foes, he will appoint an independent Commission to inquire into land taxation in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The latest figures which I have are for the year 1904–5. In that year the area of land declared forfeited for arrears of land revenue was 39,026 acres, against 80,453 acres in 1903–4. There was, therefore, a decrease, not an increase. I have seen the speech to which the hon. Member refers, and am glad to find that it also states that, owing to the issue of amended rules for land revenue remissions and suspensions, the Bombay revenue system has now been improved. I do not propose to take action in the direction suggested.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 526.

Indian Grievances.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the recent speech of Lord Curzon, he will reconsider his refusal to appoint a Committee of this House to hold an open independent inquiry in order to sift Indian grievances.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I do not conceive that Lord Curzon's speech affects my decision.

The Transvaal Loan—Outstanding Balance on an old Loan.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the sum of £1,800,000, as yet unpaid on the old Transvaal Loan has, by a book-keeping error, been allowed to remain outstanding; whether it is to be deducted from the principal of the new loan, or whether it is to be paid at all; and whether he can state what it is proposed to do in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I am not aware of any error of the kind referred to.

Irish Audit Work.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that only £800 of the Exchequer and Audit Vote is annually spent in Ireland, he will now take steps to have the Irish audit work done in Dublin, so as to give Ireland her just share of the expenditure under this and subsidiary Votes which approximately amounts to £10,000 per annum.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer given him on this subject by the right hon. Member for West Derbyshire on the 28th February, 1905,† to which I have nothing to add.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the biennial cost of preparing duplicate records in the Dublin Education Office and despatching them to the London Audit Office, and the annual cost of the work entailed in Dublin and in London of keeping these duplicate records amended up to date.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) These records are required because the establishment books in the Dublin Education Department cannot be spared for the inspection of the Comptroller and Auditor-General. The cost entailed by the records would have to be specially calculated by the two Departments, and I see no sufficient reason for calling upon them to undertake the task.

Duties of the Assistant Comptroller and Auditor-General.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the chief clerkship in the audit office was abolished because the duties were very light, as were also those of the Assistant Comptroller and Auditor; whether this official undertook to perform the duties of chief clerk in addition to his own, and applied to the Treasury for increased emoluments owing to increased work; whether it was found impossible to give him this increase; and whether, in consequence of this, he now delegates some of these duties to the private secretary.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Assistant-Comptroller and Auditor on appointment undertook to perform any additional duties that might devolve upon him as a result of the abolition of the chief clerkship then in contemplation. The suggestions in the latter sentences of the Question are entirely without foundation. There are similarly unfounded suggestions referring to the same officer in two other Questions of the hon. Member put down for later dates; and I desire to express my regret that the hon. Member should have thought fit to make suggestions of this character with regard to a high officer who occupies a position of peculiar responsibility towards this House.

Dangerous Level Crossing at Colwick, Nottinghamshire.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the death of a school girl who was run over by a train at what is known as Saville's Crossing on the Midland and

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxli., 1452.

Great Northern Railways at Colwick, Nottinghamshire, on Tuesday, 16th July; and whether, having regard to the numerous fatalities at this place during recent years, to the increase in the adjacent population and the large and increasing number of trains which pass, he will suggest to the railway companies concerned the desirability of replacing the level crossing by a bridge.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The accident in question occurred on the lines of the Great Northern Railway Company, and the company have, as my right hon. friend informed the hon. Member for South Nottingham yesterday, decided to erect a footbridge at the crossing.

The American Tobacco Trust.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has seen the suit brought against the Imperial Tobacco Company of Great Britain and Ireland in the Courts at Washington for agreements in restraint of trade with the American Tobacco Trust; and whether he will watch the same with a view to bringing in legislation against trusts here of a similar character to that proposed in the United States.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The Board of Trade are aware of the case to which the hon. Member refers. As at present advised they can hold out no hope of the introduction of legislation on the lines suggested.

Deaths caused by Eating Tuberculous Foods, etc.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state if the Returns compiled by the Registrar-General are so framed as to give the number of deaths alleged to be attributable to the eating of cooked tuberculous meat and drinking uncooked tuberculous milk; and whether the infantile mortality is specified with regard to those alleged causes.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The reply to the Question is in the negative.

Small Holdings Bill—Estimated Cost of Administration.

MR. E. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board of Agriculture have made an estimate of the total cost of the administration of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill should it pass into law; and, if so, what is the amount of that estimate.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Answer is in the negative. It is impossible to forecast the probable cost of administration until we have some experience of the amount of work to be dealt with.

Foul Brood amongst Bees.

MR. LARDNER (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he is aware of the increase of foul brood among bees; and if he will state what steps he intends to take, by legislation or otherwise, to save an industry which is now a growing and valuable asset to the Irish farmer, particularly in mountain districts.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department are aware of the existence of foul brood in many parts of Ireland, but have no information to show that it is increasing. County committees of agriculture have been empowered by the Department to deal with the disease and to grant compensation for destruction of infected hives. The Department are considering legislation to enable local authorities to deal compulsorily with the disease.

Erection of Barracks, Military Hospitals, etc., in Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

MR. WHITBREAD (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon): To ask the Secretary of State for War what military barracks, hospitals, and cantonments have been erected since the war in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies; where they are situated and what has been the total expenditure in respect of them at each place; what is the amount of accommodation at each of them and the number of troops now in occupation at each place; and to what use it is proposed to appropriate these institutions in the future.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The information is as follows:—It is proposed to appropriate these institutions in the future according to the exigencies of the service.

Station.	Accommodation.		Occupation.		Cost.
	Officers.	Men.	Officers.	Men.	
Transvaal:					£
Pretoria - - -	139	3,749	136	3,350	732,100
Potchefstroom - -	108	2,674	72	1,836	344,000
Middleburg* - -	54	2,440	20	467	248,000
Barberton* † - -	24	530	Nil	Nil	10,789
Standerton - - -	65	1,784	52	1,408	248,000
Pietersburg* † - -	12	294	Nil	Nil	20,206
Orange River Colony:					
Bloemfontein - -	145	4,250	94	2,521	561,200
Harrismith - - -	65	1,787	48	1,354	253,200

* In these cases buildings have been or are being transferred elsewhere on reduction of garrison.

† In these cases buildings have been sold.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

"H.M.S. Renown."

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what portion of the secondary armament of the "Renown" is now on shore.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): Ten 6-inch and four 12-pounders have been landed.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the estimated cost of removing the present yacht fittings from H.M.S. "Renown," and reconverting that ship within five days as a unit of the fleet available for active service.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No estimate has been prepared of the cost of replacing the "Renown's" armament in an emergency. I am imformed that if the guns were lifted in by dockyard labour the rest of the work could be done by the ship's crew.

H.M.S. "New Zealand."

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that a circular letter was issued in December, 1904, that no ship will be in dockyard hands for more than thirty working days in each year; and whether the case of H.M.S. "New Zealand," which left the Channel Fleet on 23rd April and was away 113 days before her defects were completed, indicates that the rule has been abandoned, seeing that the ship was not replaced during the time she was away.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The "New Zealand" was in dockyard hands for repairs and alterations seventy-nine days, not 113, as stated in the Question. I may point out that only ninety-eight days have elapsed from the 23rd April up till now. The inference in the last part of the Question is not correct. The Admiralty exercise their discretion in any case which seems to justify any relaxation of the usual procedure.

The Channel Fleet.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that a circular letter was issued by the Board of Admiralty in December, 1904, at the time of the redistribution of the fleets, ordering that not more than two battleships were to be absent from the Channel Fleet for the purpose of refit or of visiting their home port for leave; whether he is aware that in March, 1905, it was followed by a memorandum from the First Lord of the Admiralty stating that orders have been given that, as a rule, not more than one large vessel of a fleet or squadron is to be under repair in dockyard hands at one time, so as to insure the various fleets being kept always at their effective strength and ready for instant service; and whether the fact that as many as three or four battleships have been absent this year for many days from the present Channel Fleet indicates that the policy of previous years has been abandoned.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The reply to the first two Questions is in the affirmative. The reply to the third Question is in the negative; but, in applying the policy, the Admiralty must exercise their discretion according to the necessities of the public service for the time being.

English Shooting Team for the Colonies.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether officers who accompany the shooting team from England to the Colonies will be placed on half-pay; and, if so, for what reason. In putting this Question, may I ask, Sir, if when a number of Questions are handed in they should not appear on the Question Paper in the order in which they are handed in.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not know why the order was changed except for the convenience of the setting up the type by the printer.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The hon. Member is presumably alluding to an officer holding a staff appointment who accompanies the team. His staff pay, at the expiration of sixty-one days leave, will, in accordance with the provisions of the Royal Warrant, drop to a rate equal to the half-pay of his rank. He will not be gazetted to half-pay.

Cartridge Breech Pressures.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what are the breech pressures of the service ·303 cartridge and the Swift ·303 cartridge respectively; and what is the proof breech pressure of the service rifle.

MR. HALDANE: There are two patterns of Swift cartridge known to the War Office, one for a special chamber, the pressure given by which is not known, and another for the service chamber, giving about twenty tons per square inch at 60° F. The mean pressure given by the service cartridge at 60° F. does not exceed 16·5 tons per square inch. The service rifles are proved to twenty-one and a half tons per sqaure inch.

In reply to a further Question,

MR. HALDANE said the War Office always like to have a considerable margin of pressure in the interests of safety.

Colonial Grants to Shooting Teams.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will make inquiries as to the nature and amounts of the grants and allowances made by Colonial Governments to the shooting teams which represent their respective Colonies at Bisley and elsewhere; and whether he will give similar treatment to the team which will represent the Mother Country in the Colonies.

MR. HALDANE: I have nothing to add to the replies which have already been given to the hon. Member on this subject.

Copper Pressure Gauges.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the copper pressure gauges used by the War Department to ascertain the breech pressure of high-velocity ammunition are previously tested to approximately the same pressure as is expected from such ammunition; whether they are the 15-ton coppers ordinarily used for testing service ammunition; and whether he is aware that accurate results can only be obtained by the use of coppers which have been previously tested to within a ton of the pressure exerted by the ammunition under test.

MR. HALDANE: As regards the first part of the Question, assuming that the hon. Member refers to the coppers used in the gauges and not the pressure gauges themselves, the reply is in the affirmative. To the second part of the Question the reply is in the negative. The point raised in the last part of the Question is a matter of opinion, but as a fact coppers are so treated before use.

Bullet Velocities.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that at 1,000 yards range the remaining velocity of the ·303 service bullet is 870 foot seconds, of the German Spitzer bullet 1,040 foot seconds, and of the ·303 Swift bullet 1,240 foot seconds, and that at 2,000 yards range the remaining velocity of the ·303 service bullet is 580 foot seconds, of the German Spitzer bullet 625 foot seconds, and of the ·303 Swift bullet 820 foot seconds, he will state how the official estimate of the velocity of these bullets already given was calculated.

MR. HALDANE: No official estimate of the velocity of the Swift bullet has been given. The estimates of the velocities of the service and German Spitzer bullets were published in a memorandum last year, and are approximately the same as stated in the Question.

MR. COURTHOPE: May I give the right hon. Gentleman the accurate figures presently?

MR. HALDANE: I shall be glad to hear any figures, whether accurate or not.

Muzzle Velocity.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the ·303 Swift cartridge, giving a muzzle velocity of about 2,400 foot seconds, a fixed sight range of over 700 yards, and an extreme range of about 4,500 yards, can be used for magazine fire from the present magazines of the service rifle.

MR. HALDANE: The only Swift cartridge known to the War Office as giving 2,400 foot seconds velocity is for a special chamber differing from that of the service rifle, and cannot, therefore, be used in the latter.

Army Contracts for Wales.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that contracts to the value of upwards of £58,000 were placed in Ireland last year, he will consider the propriety of placing contracts for an equal amount in Wales during the current year.

MR. HALDANE: Orders to the amount of £23,349 were placed in Wales last year. I think it would hardly be practicable to place orders on the lines suggested by my hon. friend.

Mooltan Barracks, Tidworth.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what was the cost of Mooltan block of barracks lately erected at Tidworth; and how much it is proposed to spend on altering this block into a hospital.

MR. HALDANE: Approximately the cost of these barracks has been about £120,000. The amount allotted for the alterations for hospital purposes is £30,000.

CAPTAIN FABER: Would it not have been better to build a new hospital?

MR. HALDANE said he did not think so. These blocks were not wanted.

County Association Secretaryships.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the secretaryships of the county associations in the new Territorial Force will be open to retired officers only or to officers on full pay, or to both.

Mr. HALDANE: It would be premature to make any statement on this subject, which is now under consideration.

*Captain FABER asked if the right hon. Gentleman would also consider the claims of the warrant and non-commissioned officers?

Mr. HALDANE: The claims of the service have to be considered first.

The Royal Scots Greys.

Viscount TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the horses of the 2nd Dragoons (Royal Scots Greys) are at present picketed; and whether it is intended that they shall remain picketed throughout the winter.

Mr. HALDANE: The horses of the Scots Greys, with the exception of those of the squadron at Dorchester, are at present picketed. The reply to the rest of the Question is in the negative.

Viscount TURNOUR asked where it was proposed to put the new buildings.

[The reply was inaudible.]

*Captain FABER: Have the new stables been begun?

Mr. HALDANE: I have every reason to believe that a beginning will be made this week.

*Captain FABER: Can the right hon. Gentleman give me the name of the contractor?

Mr. HALDANE: That has been settled and I hope to report progress this week.

Scots Greys Officers' Accommodation at Tidworth.

Viscount TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that, owing to insufficient barrack accommodation at Tidworth, some of the junior officers of the 2nd Dragoons (Royal Scots Greys) have been compelled to sleep in tents; and whether he proposes to take steps to remedy this state of affairs before the winter.

Mr. HALDANE: There is nothing unusual in officers or others being placed under canvas during the camping season owing to lack of barrack accommodation, and when it is more convenient than having recourse to the lodging list of billets. These officers will not be kept under canvas during the winter months in contravention of the King's Regulations.

Viscount TURNOUR asked where it was proposed to put these officers.

Mr. HALDANE: I do not think we need trouble ourselves very much about that. They will go through the usual healthy discipline.

Viscount TURNOUR pressing for an answer,

Mr. HALDANE said those officers would be under canvas.

Viscount TURNOUR: I referred to the winter.

Mr. HALDANE: I am not talking now of the winter.

Viscount TURNOUR: Then will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of my Question?

Mr. HALDANE: I do not think the officers of the Scots Greys, which is a gallant regiment and likes to take its share of camping hardships, will thank the noble Lord for his interference.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): When do the winter months officially begin?

Mr. HALDANE: The hon. Member seems to think there is no accommodation for officers and men at Tidworth. There is very large accommodation. What is wanted is not accommodation for officers, but stables.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us where these officers are to be accommodated?

Mr. HALDANE: In the open air under tents.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: In the winter I mean.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman supply cots or cradles for officers of the type of the noble Lord?

[No Answer was returned.]

Opium Cultivation in India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, owing to the constant advance in the price of labour and in the value of crops other than opium, the ryots who cultivate opium are growing more and more dissatisfied with the present fixed price of opium; and, if so, whether he will bear the fact in mind in considering the question of reducing the area of opium cultivation in India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The Report of the Opium Department for 1905–6 contains a statement to the effect stated by the hon. Member. The fact has not been lost sight of in arranging for a substantial reduction in the area under poppy cultivation in 1907–8.

Indian Administration.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is now in a position to give any information regarding the submission of the Report on the separation of executive and judicial functions in India, called for from the Government of India in 1899, in consequence of a memorial on the subject which was signed by the late Lord Hobhouse and other distinguished retired Members of the Indian Government.

MR. MORLEY: The question is still under the consideration of the Government of India, but I am glad to believe that it is making progress towards a settlement.

MR. REES asked if the right hon. Gentleman had any proof that the mass of the people desired the creation of these magistrateships at their expense as well as the class who would occupy the position.

MR. MORLEY. As my hon. friend must know it is not the easiest thing in the world to find out what the masses want.

SIR H. COTTON asked the right hon. Gentleman if he understood that his Question was not directed to the appointment of magistrates, but simply to the separation of executive and judicial functions.

MR. MORLEY said he quite understood the purport of the Question, a most important one in India, and substantial progress was being made towards a settlement of it.

The Mymensingh Riots.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the judgments of Mr. Chotzner, district and sessions judge, Mr. Beatson Bell, additional district magistrate, Mr. Barneville, joint magistrate, and Moulvie Mahomed Momin, Moulvie Faizuddin Hossein, and Baboo Jamini Mohun Das, deputy magistrates, who were all employed in trying Mahomedan riot cases in the Mymensingh district of Eastern Bengal, to the effect that the disturbances were attributable to a wave of fanaticism due to causes specified in their judgments entirely unconnected with the boycott of British goods; whether the official explanation of these riots was that they owed their origin to the Hindoos interfering with the Mahomedans in the purchase of British goods; and whether, having regard to these conflicting statements and the importance of the matter, he will direct an independent inquiry to be made, by means of a Commission or otherwise, into the causes of the recent riots in the Mymensingh district.

MR. MORLEY: I expect to receive in due course from the local government a report giving a comprehensive view of these disturbances, and the causes to which they were due will then no doubt be further elucidated. The opinions of the officers who tried the cases will of course be taken into consideration by the local Government. There does not appear to be any reason why a special inquiry should be instituted.

Indian Agents Provocateurs.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that advertisements have appeared in Bengali newspapers asking for the services of agents provocateurs for the purpose of spreading sedition; and will he say what action the Government of Bengal proposes to take in the matter.

MR. MORLEY: An advertisement for candidates for training as political missionaries has appeared in certain Bengali newspapers, but it contained no suggestion that the so-called missionaries should act in the manner described in the Question. The Government of Bengal do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Seditious Indian Newspapers.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the newspaper named the *Indian Sociologist*, edited in London by one Shyamaji Krishnavarma, M.A., Oxon., elsewhere described as president of the Indian Home Rule Society, in which it is said in an editorial article that if a man is to be dubbed an ardent native rebel simply because he advises his countrymen to shake off an oppressive foreign yoke, we confess we are proud to be called such, and in which it is further said that there is a school of Indian patriots whose ideal is not only to have independence in government in India by ousting the English from that country, but also to recover untold millions of money of which the Indian people have been unjustly deprived, which ideal involves the occupation of England by India till such claims are satisfied; further, whether his attention has been called to the speech made by the said Shyamaji Krishnavarma, in which he says that no concession can ever satisfy him save one, the disappearance of the alien yoke from India; and whether, since the editor claims that he is no British subject, the Government will consider the propriety of moving the Public Prosecutor to proceed against this person in view to his ultimate expulsion as an undesirable alien, who endeavours to debauch the loyal subjects of His Majesty.

MR. MORLEY: I do not think that the language that my hon. friend quotes is worth either the advertisement that he has given it himself, or of that which he wishes me to give it.

MR. REES: Does the right hon. Gentleman know that this person maintains a boarding-house to which young Indians are attracted for the purpose of perversion on their arrival in this country?

MR. MORLEY: I have no official information.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the Question in order, seeing that it contains not only a long extract from a newspaper—and I have been prevented embodying extracts from the *Saturday Review* in my Questions—but it also embodies certain high rhetoric on the part of the hon. Member putting it?

MR. REES: The Question does not contain a single opinion of my own.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: But is the last line in order, in so far as it suggests endeavours to "debauch" loyal subjects?

[No Answer was returned.]

Child Labour in Indian Factories.

MR. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the Report of the Textile Factory Labour Committee, and more particularly to that part which deals with child labour; is he aware that the present practice, according to the Report of that Committee, is to work children beyond their strength, resulting in their growth and development being stunted; will he bring all pressure possible to bear on the Government of India to pass such laws and to enforce regulations that are found necessary to put an end to the existing state of things in the textile and other factories in India; and will he specially direct the attention of the authorities to the urgency of definite suggestion 7 in the Report.

MR. MORLEY: As I have already explained in answer to previous Questions on the subject, the Government of India intend to appoint a representative Commission to deal comprehensively with the question of factory labour and to propose remedies. The Report of the Committee was preliminary only. The Commission will be appointed with all despatch, and will be instructed to report with as little delay as possible. The question of child labour will, of course, receive special attention.

Chenab Canal Lands.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what was the selling price per acre of land now irrigated by the Chenab Canal before the construction of that work of irrigation, and what is the present selling price.

MR. MORLEY: Before the canal was made the land was practically valueless. Ten pounds an acre is now paid for land of fair average quality irrigated from the canal.

Moti Lal Singh.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Hindu, Moti Lal Singh, son of Amrit Lal Singh, a Swadeshi leader, who is accused of having assaulted a young Mahomedan, who lies in a precarious condition in Serajganj hospital, has been apprehended.

MR. MORLEY: Moti Lal Singh has surrendered and will be placed on his trial; the injured man is reported to have recovered.

Lala Rajpat Rai.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is yet in a position, without danger to the State, to inform the House in general terms what is the nature of the defence made by Lala Rajpat Rai under the provisions of the Ordinance of 1818 to the Government of India.

MR. MORLEY: As my hon. friend is aware, Regulation III. of 1818 does not contemplate the formulation of specific charges. But Rajpat Rai was furnished with a copy of the warrant for his arrest, and was informed that the reason for his arrest and deportation was to preserve a portion of His Majesty's dominions from internal commotion. He submitted a memorial to the Government of India denying that he has ever done anything to cause such commotion, and he has requested that his memorial may be submitted to the King. The procedure necessary for this purpose has been explained to him.

MR. MACKARNESS asked whether the memorial would be laid before the House.

MR. MORLEY could not answer the Question until he had received the memorial.

MR. REES asked whether in that part of India which was governed according to native traditions—the Native States—similar powers to those used by the British Government were not exercised by the ruling chiefs.

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): But by what method is it proposed to redress the grievances of the people of India?

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

Unskilled Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what are the conditions under which British subjects, white and coloured, may undertake to do unskilled work in the mines of the Transvaal.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The special restrictions imposed by the Labour Importation Ordinance apply to the classes specified in the Ordinance, viz.: non-Europeans other than Africans south of twelve degrees north of the equator introduced under contract for work in the mines. No similar restrictions apply to other British subjects.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked if the Government had taken any steps to remove this disability from British labour.

MR. CHURCHILL: A provision was inserted in the Transvaal constitution which will have the effect of abrogating it.

Isthmian Canal Labour Contracts.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why the Trinidad Government did not supervise the contract drawn up between the Isthmian Canal Commissioners and British subjects in the island.

MR. CHURCHILL The form of contract was approved by the Government of Trinidad.

British Garrison in Central Africa.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, what reduction has been made in the armed forces at Zomba, and if any further reduction is contemplated.

MR. CHURCHILL: The armed forces in the British Central Africa Protectorate have been reduced by two companies of 100 men and a depot company which was only provisionally stationed at Zomba. No further reduction is contemplated.

Brunei Protectorate Finance.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Federated Malay States have lent $200,000 to the Protectorate of Brunei; if so, on what security the money has been lent; whether the Government of the Malay States exercises any supervision over the Government of Brunei; whether this money is being used to defray current expenditure; whether it is proposed to make it an annual grant; and whether there is any precedent for one Colony financing another.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Answer to the first Question is in the affirmative. The State was practically bankrupt when it was taken over by His Majesty's Government and the money was needed to enable the Government to buy out a number of monopolists and to organise a system of administration. So far as I am aware no question of security has ever been raised, but the administration of Brunei is entirely under the control of His Majesty's Government, who will see that the money is repaid when the financial position of the State makes repayment possible. The Government of the Federated Malay States exercises no control over that of Brunei, but the High Commissioner for the Federated Malay States it also High Commissioner for Brunei. The revenue for last year did not cover the expenditure, and the deficit has, therefore, been met from the loan. I may perhaps point out that a British Resident was first appointed at the beginning of 1906 and that it must naturally take a little time to place the finances on a satisfactory basis. There is no intention of making an annual grant. A parallel can be found in the Malay Peninsula where the Colony of the Straits Settlements financed the Protected Malay States in their early stages and where the State of Pahang has been regularly financed by its wealthier neighbours.

MR. WEDGWOOD asked whether the proposal to finance Brunei originated in the Malay Peninsula or at home, and whether the Government encouraged the financing of non-prosperous by prosperous Colonies.

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot say where it actually originated, but I have given a precedent for this system of financing, *i.e.*, the State of Pahang.

Trinidad Foreign Labour Contracts.

MR. STARKEY (Nottinghamshire, Newark): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Trinidad Foreign Labour Contracts Ordinance (No. 106) was referred to and has received the sanction of His Majesty's Government; and, if so, whether they have taken steps to ensure that the labourers shall be treated and paid wages in accordance with the terms of that contract whilst working in the canal zone of the Isthmus of Panama.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Trinidad Foreign Labour Ordinance was sanctioned in 1900 in the usual manner, but its provisions are not applicable to contracts for labour within the Panama Canal zone. The Trinidad Government approved a form of contract based upon that scheduled to the Ordinance and the form, it is assumed, inadvertently, makes reference to the Ordinance. The Government of Trinidad was satisfied that the terms contained in the contract gave sufficient security to the labourers who are working, as I would remind the hon. Member, not for a private employer, but for an organised and carefully supervised department of the Government of the United States.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Has not the right hon. Gentleman said the terms of the contract cannot be enforced?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, I said we were sending for further particulars and more precise and definite information on the point. The question whether the contract can be enforced rests between the Governments concerned and the Canal Commission.

New Hebrides Convention.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the cause of the prolonged delay in proclaiming the New Hebrides Convention, the draft of which was signed on 20th October last year.

MR. CHURCHILL: The delay in proclaiming the Convention is due to the complicated legal questions which have first to be settled.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): Has any alteration or amendment been made in the draft Convention embodied in the Blue-book?

MR. CHURCHILL: Under the Convention there was power to make regulations. These regulations have been made with great care and elaboration.

MR. LYTTELTON: Are any alterations or amendments made in the draft Convention?

MR. CHURCHILL: In the regulations under the Convention, but not in the Convention.

Colonial Officials' Pensions.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether any permanent officials, with pension rights in other Colonies, transferred upon the responsibility of this Government to the Transvaal service, have suffered heavy material loss in consequence of changes connected with the new Government; and, if so, will they be duly compensated.

MR. CHURCHILL: My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this. I am not aware of any case in which the usual rules are not being followed in awarding the compensation due to such officers.

Transvaal Civil Service Regulations.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the leave regulations of the Transvaal Civil Service have been so altered as to deprive British members of the service of an accumulated leave enabling them occasionally to visit Great Britain, and which they were led to expect would be periodically granted to them; and whether, in granting self-government to the Transvaal, any attempt was made to safeguard the the interests of the existing members of the service.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has not heard of such an alteration; but in any case the subject falls within the proper authority of the Transvaal Government. With regard to the last part of the Question, I may refer the hon. Member to the Answer I give to his similar Question on the 23rd instant.†

China and Indian Opium.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a despatch has now been sent to the Government of China in reply to the proposals presented to the British Government on the 29th November last regarding the traffic of Indian opium to China; and, if so, whether Papers will be laid upon the Table.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I must refer the hon. Member to the reply given yesterday to the hon. Member for Holmfirth by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India.‡ It is not proposed at present to lay Papers on the subject.

Explosives from Airships.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can inform the House whether there is any prospect of a new prohibition of the use of explosives from airships being agreed to by the Hague Conference, to replace the temporary prohibition which resulted from the previous Hague Conference and has now expired.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1350.

‡ See page 457.

SIR EDWARD GREY: It is expected that this subject will come before the Conference, and we shall be glad to support an agreement to this effect.

Anglo-Russian Understanding.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what are the exact terms of the proposed understanding with Russia; and whether the British Government is insisting, as a condition of this understanding, that the constitutional form of government in Russia as laid down in the manifesto of 30th October, 1905, should be guaranteed.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am unable to make any statement as to negotiations in progress. With regard to the second part of the Question I must refer the hon. Member to the reply given yesterday to the hon. Member for Leicester.†

MR. SNOWDEN was understood to ask if the Government could not insist on Russia recognising the rights of the people.

SIR EDWARD GREY replied that it was impossible to introduce conditions affecting the internal affairs of other countries into such negotiations as these.

Russia and the Aland Islands.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Russian troops are still in occupation of the Aland Islands, in violation of the provisions of the Treaty of Paris; whether their numbers have been increased since last year; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information subsequent to that contained in the reply returned to the Question asked by the hon. Member on 25th October last.‡ No action on the part of His Majesty's Government appears to be necessary.

MR. ASHLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman make further inquiry as to the state of this garrison?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No, Sir.

MR. ASHLEY: Then how does he know the real state of the affairs?

SIR EDWARD GREY: It is the business of our agents abroad to send full information.

Treaty with Sweden and Norway.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any progress has yet been made in the negotiations between this country and other Powers with a view to the substitution of a new treaty for that of 1855 with reference to Sweden and Norway.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I can only refer the hon. Member to my reply of 14th May on this subject,§ to which, at present, I have nothing to add. When a definite conclusion has been arrived at the result will no doubt be made known by the Powers concerned.

Irish-Cured Mackerel in the United States.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the principal market for Irish-cured mackerel is in the United States; will he use his best endeavours, in connection with the important negotiations now being carried on between England, Newfoundland, Canada, and the United States, as regards the fisheries question, to represent to the United States that the tariff of 8s. per barrel now collected on Irish mackerel is seriously detrimental to the Irish fishing industry; and, in the event of Canadian fish being allowed to enter free of duty to the United States, will he endeavour to secure a similar privilege to Irish exporters.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that 70,000 barrels of Irish-cured mackerel were exported to the United States in 1906, and that £28,000 was collected by import duty; and whether, in view of the efforts now being made to secure a brand for Irish-cured fish, he will represent to the United States Government the necessity of lowering their tariff against this important Irish industry.

---

† See page 481.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxiii., 411.

§ See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 788.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am informed that the facts as stated are approximately accurate. If a favourable opportunity occurs for trying to obtain a reduction of duties in the United States on the produce of the United Kingdom, the case of Irish-cured mackerel will not be overlooked. But the negotiations on the subject of Colonial fish which took place some time ago did not lead to any result.

Opium Trade.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Chinese Government have formally given their consent to the proposals presented by the American Minister inviting China to co-operate with the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, and Japan in an inquiry into the whole question of the opium trade and production; and whether there is any objection to laying Papers on the subject.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have not yet heard that the formal consent of the Chinese Government has been given. With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's Question, the arrangements are not yet in a sufficiently advanced state to justify the laying of Papers.

Egyptian Army of Occupation—Decree of 1895.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the undertakings given by him and Lord Cromer, at various dates subsequent to the Denshawi executions, that the decree of 1895 relative to offences against the Army of Occupation would be superseded by another decree, he is in a position to state the time when such decree will be promulgated; and, if not, whether he can account for the delay in giving effect to the decision announced a year ago.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Before Lord Cromer's departure from Egypt it had already been found that the practical difficulties in the way of reforming the special tribunal were very great, and it was therefore proposed temporarily to rely upon the ordinary law courts of Egypt. In the meanwhile there is no necessity to abrogate the decree of 1895, as the special tribunal can only be convoked on the application of His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General, who has been instructed not to take this step without previous reference to His Majesty's Government.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked if he was to understand that the undertaking given by the right hon. Gentleman had not been fulfilled and that there was no intention of fulfilling it.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The special tribunal is not now in existence, and so long as it is not in existence the decree cannot be promulgated.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could not call it into existence by a stroke of the pen.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The undertaking I gave was that the tribunal should be called into existence when the reforms were introduced.

Khedivial School of Law at Cairo.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the appointment of an Englishman to preside over the Khedivial School of Law at Cairo is due to the opinion that the students were, in large numbers, friendly to the Nationalist agitation, and had signed the recent petition for the pardon of the Denshawi prisoners.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer is the negative.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that in the semi-native Press, which was under British control, the statement was made which appeared in his Question.

SIR EDWARD GREY said he was not aware that the Press was under British control.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Then the right hon. Gentleman is the only Member of the House who is not aware of it.

Post Office Savings Bank Finance.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the balance sheet published by the Post Office Savings Bank shows that, on 31st December, 1906, it was liable to its depositors for £156,142,546, all payable at call or at a few days notice, that the securities representing its assets were worth at the price of that day no more than £143,058,808, and that the Savings Bank was therefore insolvent to the amount of £13,083,738; is he aware that on the 20th November, 1906, the liabilities of the Government to trustee savings banks exceeded on that day the value of the securities held by £3,142,593, that the liabilities to friendly societies exceeded the value of the securities held by £247,635, that the total excess of Government liability over the value of the securities held was, in those three cases, £16,473,966, and that the total cash balances held towards meeting it were no more than £252,757, as shown by Parliamentary Papers, Nos. 73 and 214, of 1907; is he aware that, since those dates, the value of all the securities in question has fallen by from one to two per cent., thereby increasing the total deficiency of assets, and that a forced sale would still further reduce their value; and, in view of the fact that the Consolidated Fund is liable to make good all these and any other and greater deficiencies that may arise, and that these deficiencies are yearly increasing, why does he not take some measure to ensure the holding by the savings banks of an adequate gold reserve, such as bankers in similar cases are expected and accustomed to hold, why does he permit the cash balances to remain as low as they are, and why does he not take measures to reduce this total deficit of over £16,000,000 by charging a portion thereof from time to time upon, and paying it out of, the Consolidated Fund to the insolvent savings banks.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The figures quoted in the Question, so far as they are drawn from the published returns, are correct. I must remind the hon. Member that a Select Committee of this House in 1902 condemned as misleading the practice of valuing the securities held for these funds at the current market price. The security of the Post Office Savings Bank depositors, of the trustee banks, and of the friendly societies who have invested with the National Debt Commissioners depends, not upon the assets held by those Commissioners, but upon the liability of the Consolidated Fund to satisfy their claims in case of need, as has been stated over and over again in this House by successive Ministers. The reasons which require commercial banks to have command of substantial gold reserves do not apply to the savings banks. The cash balances held on their account are such as experience shows to be necessary for the conduct of the business.

Consolidated Fund Charges.

MR. BOWLES: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been given to the fact that numerous small sums, aggregating £1,128 8s. 8d., transferred from the land revenues of the Crown, are yearly paid out of the Consolidated Fund to various persons and bodies, including the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and certain precentors and ministers of Gaelic and other churches in Scotland; and in view of the perpetual character of universities and of Scottish precentors and ministers, will he take steps to cummute these payments and so to relieve the Consolidated Fund.

MR. ASQUITH: These allowances are the survivals of a longer list which has been reduced by commutation as opportunities occurred. There is no power to enforce commutation upon the recipients, but the Treasury is always willing to discuss terms with them.

Dublin and Charles II.

MR. BOWLES: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state why an allowance of £714 11s. 8d. is, and has been since 1801, paid annually out of the Consolidated Fund to the Lord Mayor and citizens of Dublin; what portion thereof, if any, reaches the citizens; and is this charge on the Consolidated Fund perpetual.

MR. ASQUITH: The allowance is charged permanently on the Consolidated Fund by the Act 41, Geo. III., Cap. 32. It represents (1) a perpetual annuity of £500 (Irish currency) granted by Charles II. for services rendered by the city to himself and his father; and (2) another perpetual annuity of £300 (Irish) representing the pay of a captaincy of Foot which had been conferred on the Lord Mayor and his successors. The payments up to the time of the Union were charged on the Irish Civil List. The allowance is paid to the cashier of the Bank of Ireland as attorney for the Corporation. I have no information as to its subsequent application.

MR. BOWLES: Seeing that this is a perpetual charge, will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of commuting it?

MR. ASQUITH: The Answer I have just given, I think, covers that.

Friendly Society Officials and the Workmen's Compensation Act.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether paid officials of the friendly societies are exempted from being insured under the Employers' Liability Bill; and, if not, whether he will consider the hardship that is inflicted upon friendly societies in having to insure their officials, and so incurring loss.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): No special provision is made in the Workmen's Compensation Act with regard to the officers of friendly societies, and I see no reason why such officers, if they come within the definition of "workman" in the Act, should not be entitled to compensation for accidents arising out of and in the course of their employment. I do not see that insurance involves any special hardship on friendly societies.

Motor 'Bus Traffic in Piccadilly.

CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the noise and discomfort caused to residents in Piccadilly, and other streets where there are hills, by motor omnibuses changing their speeds on such hills; and whether His Majesty's Government will confer such powers on the Chief Commissioner of Police as will enable him to deal drastically and on his own initiative with such nuisances.

MR. GLADSTONE: My attention has not been specially called to this matter. All drivers of motor omnibuses are tested as to their capacity to change gear without undue noise, but at times they are careless. The general standard of skill in driving is being gradually raised.

CAPTAIN FABER: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of my Question?

MR. GLADSTONE: I see no reason to take any steps at the present time.

MR. LUPTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware there is a patent change gear which makes no noise at all?

MR. GLADSTONE: Perhaps my hon. friend will give me details of it.

Anti-Russian Demonstration in Trafalgar Square.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S).: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the violence of the police against the people in Whitehall on 15th July, after they were leaving the demonstration that was held in Trafalgar Square to protest against the Government entering into any agreement with the Russian Government; if he is aware that the police on the day in question broke a number of the people's umbrellas, banner poles, tore some banners up which were being carried by the people, without warning or requesting the people to go away; if he is aware that a number of persons were beaten by constables with bamboo canes that had been broken up, and which had been used as banner poles; and whether he intends to take any action in the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am informed that the intervention of the police on the occasion in question became necessary in consequence of an attempt being made to hold a meeting in Whitehall after the meeting in Trafalgar Square was concluded. The action taken by the police to stop the obstruction which was caused to the traffic on the road and footways was resisted and some disorder ensued, but no more force than was necessary was used by the police to suppress it. The matter has already been under investigation at the Bow Street Police Court, where the solicitor for the defendants, Kaplinski and Nevell, stated that he cast no reflection upon the way in which Inspector Jarvis, who was in charge of the police, carried out his duties. On the information in my possession and after full consideration I find no ground for intervention.

Maintenance of Main Roads.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Government contemplates making the main roads a national charge.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has already stated that this matter shall be considered when the general question of local taxation comes to be dealt with. I do not think I can add anything to that statement.

Mortality Statistics.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages intends to issue a Report on the mortality experienced in certain occupations, in continuation of the Supplement to the 55th Annual Report, Part II. (Cd. 8503 of 1897); and, if so, when such Report is likely to be issued.

MR. JOHN BURNS: As stated in the Registrar-General's letter to me which is prefixed to Part I. of the Supplement to his 65th Annual Report, Part II. of that Supplement, which will contain particulars of the mortality in certain occupations, is already in an advanced state of preparation. It is hoped that it will be issued about the end of the present year.

Croydon Vaccination Cases.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that the boy who died at Croydon on the 29th April last, and whose case was investigated by Dr. Copeman, of the Local Government Board, only broke out into sores about a week or ten days after vaccination, and that it was in order to cure these sores that the public vaccinator prescribed bromide treatment; and, if this is so, will he refer the question of the safety or otherwise of calf lymph to a Committee of the House or a Royal Commission.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I do not understand that the facts are as my hon. friend supposes. I am informed that the child was unsuccessfully vaccinated on 4th January and successfully on the 11th of that month. The sores seem to have first appeared on the 24th January, whilst the bromide was first administered on the 7th January. It will be seen, therefore, that the administration of the bromide commenced before the sores made their appearance. I do not understand that it was prescribed in order to cure the sores. It seems to have been suggested as a remedy for fits from which the child suffered.

MR. LUPTON asked the right hon. Gentleman to make further inquiry as to whether the public vaccinator did not advise the use of bromide to cure the sores.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have made inquiries and my information is as I have stated in the Answer.

Channel Islands and Joint Stock Companies.

MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can say what was the result of the conference of representatives of the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, which was held on the 4th of this month at the suggestion of the Board of Trade, with the object of ascertaining whether the law relating to joint stock companies in those islands could be made more uniform with that in force in this country?

*THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): A very useful discussion took place at the conference referred to, and there was a general agreement that greater uniformity in the law relating to joint stock companies was desirable. It is hoped that in course of time this general agreement may be followed by legislative results.

Railway Tank Engines.

MR. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the tank engines of the precursor class running on the London and North Western Railway, in the neighbourhood of Stockport and Buxton; if he will inquire into the number of times these engines have left the rails during the past six months; and whether their construction is such as to render them dangerous to work upon this portion of he railway.

*MR. KEARLEY: The Board of Trade have communicated with the London and North Western Railway Company, and are informed that these engines, which were specially built to work passenger trains over the steep gradients between Manchester and Buxton, have proved a success, and that the company do not consider that their construction is such as to render their use upon this portion of the railway dangerous. It is added that in the last six months engines of this last class have been derailed on five occasions, of which four were in sidings and not on running lines, while the other occurred when passing through a crossing which was being re-laid, the chairs being temporarily held by spikes.

The Post Office and Ferry Maintenance.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is the practice of the Post Office to make any voluntary or other contribution to the upkeep of public ferries in respect of user of those ferries by servants of the Post of Office; and whether he is prepared to make such a contribution to the Knott End ferry, which is maintained at great expense by the Fleetwood Urban District Council.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.; for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): It is not the practice of the Post Office to make any contribution to the upkeep of ferries which Post Office servants are entitled to use free of charge, and I am unable to sanction such a contribution in respect of the use made of the Knott End ferry by postmen or telegraph messengers on duty, who are expressly exempted from payment by the Fleetwood Improvement Act of 1893. Post Office servants not employed on the conveyance of mails or telegrams pay the usual fare.

MR. ASHLEY: In view of the fact that the Treasury, although not legally liable, pay rates in respect of public buildings and Royal palaces, will the question of the ferries be reconsidered?

CAPTAIN NORTON; I will lay it before the Postmaster-General.

Magazine Rates to Canada.

MR. BOULTON (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if the new regulations allowing English papers and magazines to go to Canada at a reduced rate, provided they are carried by a packet sailing direct for a Canadian port, have led to any appreciable increase in the number of English papers and magazines sent under these new regulations.

CAPTAIN NORTON: The reduction of the rate of postage on British newspapers, magazines, and trade journals sent to Canada has already resulted in a very considerable increase in the number of British periodicals sent by post from the United Kingdom to the Dominion. But the new rate has not yet been long enough in force to enable me to make more than a general statement.

MR. BOULTON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can see his way to allow the reduced postage on papers and magazines to Canada to apply to papers and magazines sent to Canada via New York.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I would point out that, under the arrangement with Canada, the Dominion Government bears the whole cost of the conveyance, etc., of the articles in question from Liverpool by vessels under contract with the Canadian Government. The concession is not therefore applicable to vessels going to New York.

Education Grant.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if regulations, informing the local education authorities of the methods to be adopted for ascertaining the wishes of parents in single-school areas in view of providing a school, are to be issued; and if they will be laid upon the Table.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (MR. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): If the hon. Member is referring to the grant of £100,000 for the provision of new Schools, I am not prepared to make any further statement beyond the Answer which was given to the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division on the 22nd instant, to the effect that I have under consideration regulations, compliance with which will be necessary in order to obtain a grant. These regulations will in due course be laid upon the Table.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): Will there be any opportunity of discussing these regulations?

MR. MCKENNA: I understand it will be taken on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

New Forest Commoners.

SIR ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that Captain Reynolds, a registered commoner of the New Forest, has been refused by the Crown authorities the right of common, of fuelwood, and of turbary, to which he is entitled by virtue of the statutory register of the New Forest commoners; and what is the reason for such refusal.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The Commissioner of Woods in charge of the New Forest is advised that the rights of fuelwood and common of turbary referred to in the Question have been lost owing to the pulling down and removal of the ancient messuage to which they were attached.

SIR ROBERT HOBART: By whom has the Commissioner of Woods and Forests been advised? Is the hon. Gentleman aware that such questions as these arise entirely from the want of sympathy with the rights of the commoners and the constant attempts to ride roughshod over them?

MR. RUNCIMAN: No, Sir. The rights of these commoners are very clearly defined by law, and we have no power to grant common rights in regard to the messuage which has been pulled down and destroyed.

Parliamentary Reports.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if a decision has yet been arrived at concerning the recommendation that Parliamentary Reports should be published, as in America, in handy octavo volumes by subjects, instead of the unwieldy tomes now in vogue; and if, having regard to the desirability of securing general study of the discussion on preferential trade in the Imperial Conference, a beginning can be made with its issue in cheap form instead of in the 56-ounce 5s. book with which it is now incorporated.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I regret that I am unable at present to add anything to the reply which I made to a similar Question from the hon. Member on the 20th June.†

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: How much longer are we to wait? This has been going on a year or more.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am afraid I cannot make any announcement. So many authorities have to be consulted.

Wrexham Parochial Charities.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, as representing the Charity Commissioners, when the scheme for the administration of the Wrexham Parochial Charities will be completed and published.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): A draft scheme in this case was published on 19th April. Some suggestions were made by the Town Council and the Board of Education which necessitated correspondence with those bodies and the trustees from whom the Commissioners are now awaiting replies. I do not anticipate a long delay, and will do what

---

†See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 621–2.

I can to expedite the sealing of the scheme.

"Daily Graphic" Irish Photographs.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he has seen the statement of a correspondent in the *Daily Graphic* for Friday, 26th July, that a moonlighting outrage occurred, and that, owing to the light being bad, he induced the actual perpetrators to pose for a photograph at a more convenient time; whether he is aware that the photograph is so disposed that the faces of the perpetrators are concealed; and will he say whether the names of the perpetrators have been communicated to the police; and in these circumstances, seeing that this correspondent on his own confession is an accessory after the fact, will proceedings be taken in the interests of law and order.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): I have read the statement referred to in the Question. The inspector-general of the Royal Irish Constabulary has no information in regard to the alleged photographing, nor have the names of the perpetrators of the alleged outrage been communicated to the police. In the inspector-general's opinion it is scarcely credible that a number of persons who had been engaged in a moonlighting outrage would voluntarily pose for a photograph in the presence of a possible witness against them, and I must say that I am of the same opinion. In the circumstances there is obviously no evidence upon which the newspaper correspondent could be prosecuted.

MR. HERBERT: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the meaning of his Answer is that the story of the correspondent as recorded in the *Daily Graphic* is a flight of imagination?

MR. CHERRY: The hon. Member must take his own meaning out of it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the result of their inquiries is that the Government do not believe that any such outrage took place at all?

MR. CHERRY: Personally, I do not believe it did.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman suggest any means by which newspapers can be prevented, not only from publishing false statements, but from actually reproducing pictorial representations of them?

MR. CHERRY: I am afraid I do not see any means by which we can proceed against newspapers.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that photographs of imaginary scenes at Cork Assizes have also been produced?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this is only following the example of the *Morning Leader* in regard to the Chinese labour cartoon?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is it not the fact that the pictures to which the hon. and gallant Gentleman refers were sketches, and those referred to in the Question were photographs?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: What difference does that make?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: A good deal of difference.

MR. CHERRY: I have not seen the *Morning Leader*, and therefore I cannot say.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is a case in the books in which a man was prosecuted for a libel on a whole people when Buonaparte was first Consul?

[No Answer was returned.]

Deportation of Paupers to Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the intended deportation from Craiglockhart Workhouse, Edinburgh, to Newry Workhouse, of Edward Farrell, who had become chargeable to the Edinburgh rates; whether he is aware that Farrell left Newry when a boy, and spent about sixty years of his life in Scotland; and whether he will communicate with the Local Government Board for Scotland with a view to securing that the country which has had the benefit of his labour for so many years will be responsible for his maintenance in his declining days.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Local Government Board for Ireland understand the facts to be substantially as stated in the Question. The Edinburgh Parish Council, however, say that Farrell has never acquired a settlement in any parish in Scotland. The Newry Board of Guardians are taking an appeal against Farrell's removal to their union. Under Section 5 of the Poor Law (Scotland) Act, 1898, the decision in such case rests entirely with the Local Government Board for Scotland, who will doubtless give full consideration to all the circumstances of the case.

MR. FLYNN asked if it was not the fact that under the law as it stood paupers could be deported to, but not from Ireland?

MR. BIRRELL: I think the law requires amendment.

Roe Estate, Queen's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether negotiations for the sale of the Roe estate, Mountsalem, Queen's County, are pending before the Estates Commissioners; and if so, can he say what provision is being made for the evicted tenants' representative named Delany, who claims reinstatement on this property.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are negotiating for the purchase of the estate mentioned in the Question. They have received from Joseph Delany an application for reinstatement in a holding on the estate, and will give full consideration to Delany's claim in the event of their acquiring the estate.

King's County Rents—Case of Mrs. Mary Connor.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sub-Commissioners Tuckey and Hawkins, in fixing a second term rent recently on the holding of Mrs. Mary Connor, Bogtown, Cloneygowan, King's County, raised the first term rent of £21 10s., settled in 1890, to £25 4s., also depriving the tenant of turbary rights; and, considering that the old rent of the farm prior to 1890 was only £24, can he say what course he proposes to take with reference to those Sub-Commissioners.

MR. BIRRELL: The Land Commission inform me that the facts are as stated in the Question, save that the first term judical rent was fixed on the basis that the tenant had no right of turbary. If either party is aggrieved by the order of the Sub-Commission fixing the judicial rent for a second term, he has a statutory right to have the case reheard in the prescribed manner.

Legan Evicted Tenants.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Catherine Glancy, of Carrawreagh, P. Moran, of Belragh, and Michael Duffy, of Legan, have made application, as evicted tenants, for reinstatement; and that their cases were inquired into at Carrick-on-Shannon, in September of last year; and whether any decision has been arrived at with regard to the same.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have investigated the applications referred to, and, upon full considerations of the circumstances of each case, have decided that they can take no action.

Ancketill Grove Demesne, County Monaghan.

MR. LARDNER (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are about to take over the Ancketill Grove demesne on the estate of C. K. Cordner, county Monaghan, for the purpose of dividing it into holdings; if so, will he see that steps are taken to give preference to evicted tenants who formerly held farms, sons of tenants, and tenant purchasers, under the early Purchase Acts, of small holdings on the Ancketill Grove estate, of which this demesne formed part; and will he further state how it is proposed to deal with the residence in the demesne.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that their inspector is at present inquiring into the claims of all applicants for the untenanted land referred to in the Question. When the inspector's report has been received, the Commissioners will, before preparing a scheme for the division of the land, give full consideration to the claims of the several classes of persons mentioned in the Question. The Commissioners have not yet arrived at a decision as to the disposal of the residence on the estate.

Irish Rating System.

MR. LARDNER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that on the 15th February last a representative deputation from urban districts in the counties of Antrim, Armagh, Cavan, Down, and Monaghan waited on the Local Government Board, and urged the assimilation of the law in Ireland as to the assessment and collection of poor rate and town rate in urban districts, and also the relief of tenants of houses in urban districts valued at under £5 from the payment of rates, and that the Vice-President of the Local Government Board informed the deputation that the matter would receive careful consideration; and if he will now state what action he proposes to take in this matter.

MR. BIRRELL: I am aware that the deputation referred to waited on the Local Government Board. The question of introducing legislation with the object of facilitating the collection of rates and removing certain difficulties to which the deputation called attention, has received the consideration of the Government, but it has not been found possible to introduce a Bill this session.

Civil Rights of Irish Teachers.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have refused definitely to remove the restrictions placed by their rules on the teachers of Ireland in connection with their civil rights; and whether the Commissioners were unanimous in such refusal when the matter was last discussed.

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, Sir; the Commissioners have definitely refused to make any further modification of their rules relating to the civil rights of teachers, but I have no information as to whether their decision was unanimous.

MR. MURPHY: Will the right hon. Gentleman ascertain if the decision was unanimous?

MR. BIRRELL: I will inquire.

Irish Board of Works Accountant.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether it is intended to fill the post vacated by the present accountant in the Board of Works, Dublin; if so, what is the cause of the delay in so doing; whether the three officials next entitled by seniority and efficiency to the position are Catholics; and will steps be taken to secure that the qualifications of these officials will be considered before the Secretary, Mr. Williams, is allowed to prejudice their claims in the interest of a non-Catholic.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I understand that this appointment was made more than a week ago and will be announced in due course. As regards the last part of the hon. Member's Question, I must refer him to my Answer of 23rd April last† which, though relating to the Treasury Remembrancer, is equally applicable to the present Question.

MR. DELANY: Was the appointment made before my Question appeared on the Paper?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Yes.

MR. DELANY: Who has been appointed?

MR. RUNCIMAN: The announcement will be made in due course.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Does the hon. Gentleman know who has been appointed?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Yes, Sir.

MR. DELANY: Is it a nominee of Mr. Williams?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1576.

THE RADIO-TELEGRAPHIC CONVENTION.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) asked the Prime Minister whether he was aware of the report in the public Press of the rumoured ratification of the Radio-Telegraphic Convention by His Majesty's Government, whether he would say how far it was correct, and whether, in view of the importance of the subject to the defence and commerce of the Empire, he was now in a position definitely to fix a sitting for the discussion of the bearing of the Report.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I have not seen the report referred to. The ratification has not taken place, and I can only repeat my previous statement that no further time will be given for the discussion of the matter.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: In consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of the reply I beg to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the Report of the Select Committee on the Radio-Telegraphic Convention, and the declared intention of His Majesty's Government to proceed to ratification without affording the House an opportunity of discussion on the subject.

And, the pleasure of the House being signified, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter past eight this evening.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.

Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 278.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 278.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 294.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following Fifteen Members (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill):—Sir Edward Boyle, Mr. Hugh Barrie, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Charles Craig, Sir Samuel Scott, Mr. Nield, Mr. Staveley-Hill, Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Hills, Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. John Ward, Sir Randall Cremer, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. M'Killop, and Mr. Trevelyan.

Report to lie upon the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).

Report from the Select Committee brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 279.]

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY reported from the Chairmen's Panel; that they had discharged Mr. Eugene Wason from being Chairman of the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills; That they had discharged Sir William Holland from being Chairman of Standing Committee A, and had appointed him to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills in place of Mr. Eugene Wason; That they had discharged Mr. Stuart-Wortley from being Chairman of Standing Committee C, and had appointed Mr. John William Wilson to act as Chairman of the said Committee C, in his place, such discharge and appointment to take effect at the conclusion of the Proceedings on the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill.

Report to lie upon the Table.

FINANCE BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said he wished to make his protest against the system of taxation prevailing in this country, and against the immutability of free-trade principles so-called. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had spoken of Great Britain as the one free and untrammelled market of the world. That was perfectly correct, but in its free and untrammelled condition it gave great advantages to the workpeople and manufacturers of foreign nations. The right hon. Gentleman himself in his time had had his doubts, if not about the immutability of free trade, at least about the principle of it. He most certainly had had his doubts about the prophecies made in regard to free trade. In 1900 the right hon. Gentleman said that there was not the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone that in the international markets we were fighting for our trade with all our available strength He had also made another statement which might be commended to hon. Members opposite. In 1903, the right hon. Gentleman said that there were disquieting features with regard to the matter, and in industrial as in social conditions no honest observer, certainly no member of the party of progress, would be found to deny that they had seen industries in which we ought to have maintained our supremacy, falling behind, and in some cases entirely taken away from us by our competitors.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): Hear, hear!

SIR GILBERT PARKER, continuing, said the right hon. Gentleman cried "Hear, hear!" to that. Yet in spite of this fact he could find no remedy for the position in which England found herself to-day with regard to the matter. The right hon. Gentleman was quite ready to say that the prophecies had come true. It was said that we were going to convert the world by our free trade policy, but no single country had been converted, and all our Colonies, whilst starting with free trade, had ended up by establishing a tariff. Despite this, the right hon. Gentleman was still perfectly satisfied. The fault he had to find with the right hon. Gentleman was that he was too pharisaical. He believed him to be a Pharisee of finance. The right hon. Gentleman was so enamoured of the worship of his ancestors and of the past that, like the Scribes and Pharisees of old, he stood by the letter of the law and would listen to no change whatsoever. He (Sir Gilbert) wished to make a protest against the system of taxation which compelled the people of this country to pay £64,000,000 a year for food, drink, and tobacco, £13,000,000 being taxation on food. He did not object to a tax upon food; that was to say, a tax upon sugar and coffee and tea, and those things which were considered the necessaries of life. A tax upon such articles was necessary in order to reach all the classes of the community, but he did object most strongly to the disproportion of the taxes levied upon those articles. They were too high, and when they had got too high a tax upon any one article of food its consumption diminished, trade was injured, and the people were prevented from getting a full supply. The view he took was that if they distributed their taxation over a wider area the consumption was not reduced, whilst the pressure of individual taxation was scarcely felt. The trouble with the right hon. Gentleman's system of taxation was that it was rigid and inflexible and left no opportunity for escape. If the system were distributed there would be a reasonable elasticity and a chance of retrenching individual expenditure and reducing the pressure of taxation. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that in order to meet demands, he must turn in the future either to the land, or to the income-tax, or to some hitherto unexplored region of which they were not aware. At the present time they had a sort of Chinese puzzle to deal with in the matter of raising money to meet demands, because the area of taxation was so narrow and the things upon which the right hon. Gentleman wished to put a tax so small. He would suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should impose a tax upon silks, a source of revenue which he ventured to say would not be unsatisfactory to hon. Members below the gangway. At the present time we received from £11,000,000 to £12,000,000 worth of silk a year from abroad, chiefly from France. If that were taxed, say at 20 per cent., or even 10 per cent., the Exchequer would get anything from £1,500,000 to £2,500,000 additional revenue, very little of which would be paid by those people whom hon. Members below the gangway claimed, with such great emphasis, to represent. He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman's reply would be to this suggestion; he expected it would be the old reply of the immutable principle of free trade. The right hon. Gentleman would doubtless prefer to put 65 per cent. on the poor man's tea and 30 per cent. on sugar. He declined, however, to put a tax upon corn, because, he said, that would touch the food of the people, and bear heavily upon them.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): It will take ten years to undo the policy of the late Government.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he did not see that the present Government had made much attempt to undo the policy of their predecessors. If ever there was a Chancellor of the Exchequer in the history of the country who had relied upon the principles laid down by his predecessors, it was the right hon. Gentleman opposite. He had done absolutely nothing to change the policy of his predecessors.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has reduced the National Debt.

SIR GILBERT PARKER, said that that was not a change in policy. The predecessors of the right hon. Gentleman had also reduced the National Debt. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer was the most orthodox of orthodox Chancellors of the Exchequer, and if he could find no way out of his trouble he would do the same next year as he had done this, and would make no fundamental alteration in the existing heavy taxation. The right hon. Gentleman would not deal with corn. When his hon. friend behind him asked what the taxation of corn during the years 1902–3 had come to he was told £1,876,644. And that was paid by the foreigner.

MR. ASQUITH: The whole of that tax went into the Exchequer.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he was glad of the right hon. Gentleman's interruption, because he wanted to say that the right hon. Gentleman was by no means certain that all that tax was paid by the people of this country. He would not get the shippers or the railway people in the United States or any one who knew the conditions of transport to agree that the small tax of 2s. per quarter on corn meant that the price of bread would go up. He knew that it went up in a few instances. Lord St. Aldwyn in the course of a speech strongly advocated a corn tax and prophesied its success and that it would not interfere with the price of bread. Afterwards with his free trade prejudices he said that bread did go up in some parts of the country. In such a case he would say that it was well to watch the bakers. Unless the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take the tax off tea and sugar he had no right to say that he would not tax corn.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.) made a remark which was inaudible in the Gallery.

*MR. SPEAKER said he understood that the hon. Member was not raising a question of order.

MR. BYLES said he did not wish to rise to a point of order, but to clear up what had been said by Lord St. Aldwyn.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he would quote what Lord St. Aldwyn did say—

> "In 1902 he foresaw a great deal of opposition to the proposed corn-tax; that it would arouse prejudice and lead to the cry of 'tax on food.' But he was convinced that in no other form of indirect taxation could so much money be found creating so little an effect and injury to trade and commerce."

MR. BYLES said that it was Lord St. Aldwyn's second speech that contained the point to which he wished to direct the hon. Member's attention.

SIR. GILBERT PARKER said he had not Lord St. Aldwyn's second speech with him, but if he rightly interpreted Lord St. Aldwyn he said he thought the corn tax would not affect the price of food although in some cases in some parts of the country the price of bread did go up.

MR. BYLES said that the price of bread did go up in Manchester.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that he could not continue that particular form of argument any further. If the present high tax on sugar was maintained it would be injurious to the country, because sugar formed such a large part of the raw material in the confectionery trade. He contended that the taxes on alcohol, sugar, and tobacco had somewhat restricted trade. The right hon. Gentleman relied too much on those orthodox taxes, and because he needed money refused to lighten their effect in any way. He was put in the position which he occupied in order to give relief to the taxpayer in two ways: by reducing taxation and by reducing expenditure. He however, had not reduced either expenditure or taxation to any effective extent. His pedantry carried him too far, and he clung to a system of taxation which would not meet the needs of the country and the expenditure which had increased and was bound to increase. Moderate direct taxation and indirect taxes on manufactured articles for the purposes of revenue, he (Sir Gilbert Parker) believed, would give an opportunity for greater ease of payment on the part of the consumer; and also, what was much more important, would make it possible to throw some of that taxation on the foreigner. He knew that some hon. Gentlemen did not believe that. He had lived in protectionist countries and he knew that they could not get a Minister in any protectionist country in the world who would not say that where they had a small tax on manufactured articles which were also manufactured in those countries where the competition was strong against the imported articles, in a vast number of cases the foreign importer paid the tax by lowering the price of his goods so as to cover the tax. That was the case in Canada and in Australia. That was a logical and a reasonable proposition. That was what the Leader of the Opposition aimed at in the policy for which he had argued. A tariff tax for the purposes of revenue was a reasonable and logical policy. The policy which he advocated went a little further, and carried them into the Colonial field, and into the field of preference, into the Empire at large, where our greatest markets awaited us. It was not in the protective markets of the world that we were to look for an increase in the sale of our goods. We must look to neutral and the Colonial markets. In the neutral markets we had great competition, although we held our own. But those neutral markets were not going to be increased. China and Japan were not going to be any longer the great field for exploration on behalf of our goods as they had been in the past. We had had the best out of China and Japan. Japan in fact was fast becoming an industrial country and a producer of manufactured goods. Japan and the United States were becoming more our competitors in the Far East. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer and other Gentlemen opposite talked about the United States being feeble competitors of ours they forgot that the United States and Germany sent practically nothing to the Far East thirty years ago. The United States was only making a beginning because she had hitherto been satisfied with the markets within her own borders. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had truly said that we were fighting for our lives. The chance of increasing our position in neutral and in foreign markets was diminishing. There remained open to us great Colonial markets where, however, the foreigners were gaining ground every day because of our existing fiscal system. British trade alone in 1894 controlled 72 per cent. of the whole. In 1905 it controlled 57 per cent. of the whole. Foreign trade rose from 16 per cent. of the whole in 1894 to 30 per cent. in 1905. There was a field for the development of our trade the like of which was not offered to any other country in the world, and if we could do it without sacrificing ourselves that trade should be cultivated. The time was past when it could be said, as Mr. Gladstone once said, that the Colonies were not a source of strength to us — a doctrine of the dark middle ages. Time and opportunity and bad trade were helping us to prove that the ideal which tariff reformers had was good for us and good for the Colonies. We wanted not only to develop and create markets but to preserve the markets we had. When he was in Australia he realised that very soon the ships in Sydney Harbour would not be all British. He did not say that we should have all the trade in the world, but he thought we should preserve that trade which naturally belonged to us, especially in view of the fact that Germany gave subsidies to the German steamships going out there. Bismarck's policy always was that they should send away goods and not men. When Germany and France had done so much to develop their trade with Australia and lower the trade which hitherto we had done with that Colony, he commended to the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench their own precedent in a matter of this kind. They were subsidising the Canadian-Pacific Railway by a heavier contribution for the carrying of mails than was warranted for the purpose. They were promoting an "all red" route across Canada and Australia; that was a bounty, and a bounty was the most extreme form of protection. If right hon. Gentlemen meant what they said at the Colonial Conference, and he liked to believe that they did, in offering to preserve an "all red" route round the world, they were supporting an extreme form of protection which even some of them on that side of the House might hesitate to advocate. The Chancellor of the Exchequer at that Conference was in an extremely difficult position, and he had great sympathy with him. After what the right hon. Gentleman had said in 1903 he wondered that he was able to go to the Conference at all. At the recent Conference the real discussion was about preference and there was nothing which the Colonial Premiers considered so important. The right hon. Gentleman said the scheme which was evolved from the brain of a statesman whose absence they all deplored was fraught with mischief and dangers to fiscal union. Was that Conference anything else than one to discuss Colonial preference? The right hon. Gentleman realised that, and he was diplomatic.

Mr. ASQUITH said he thought he was said to have "slammed the door."

Sir GILBERT PARKER said that that was after the Colonial Premiers had left London. Ministers showed profound hospitality to the Colonial Premiers outside the Conference, but inside it they gave them "bitter bread."

Mr. ASQUITH said that whatever he said was said in the face of the Colonial Premiers.

Sir GILBERT PARKER replied that what the right hon. Gentleman had said was said before the Colonial Premiers came over. The right hon. Gentleman did not, in fact, believe in the Conference at all. The attitude of the Colonial Premiers showed that they were prepared to give reasonable consideration to the great question at issue, but it was impossible for the right hon. Gentleman with his hands tied to do anything. The complaint was that the Government decided the question without discussion. They were all agreed that raw material should be admitted free; that was admitted by tariff reformers as well as by right hon. Gentlemen opposite [Ministerial cries of "Why?"] He wished to keep to the point, and to explain his reason for advocating the admission of raw material. It gave that which was necessary to the worker to prevent his being handicapped. While they were all convinced that raw material should come in free, where they differed was as to the amount of work to be put into that raw material. There was what he might call the staircase of production, such as prevailed in Germany and America. There they said, "Admit your raw material as free as possible, and then work it up through the earlier stages of production until it becomes the highly-finished article." There was the question of hides from Argentina. There was a time when the harbour of Liverpool was, speaking figuratively, filled with ships which had carried hides from Argentina, but at the present time the United States took the raw hides from the Argentine from the lowest to the highest quality, and having manufactured them they got a return in the shape of wages. What was the manufactured material for one set of purchasers was the raw material for another. Some of our trades were disappearing because we had discarded the opportunity of working up raw material from all sorts of forms to the highest state of perfection. While tariff reformers approved of the system of free imports of raw materials, they challenged the system of free imports of foreign manufactured goods on the ground that, by giving the foreigner a double free market, they had made for the increase of importation of raw materials in foreign countries and the decrease of importation of manufactured goods and a lessening percentage of increase in raw material in England with a constant increase of manufactured materials. He would take the test of the figures with regard to the comparative imports of raw material. In 1883 the imports into the United Kingdom were £165,000,000, and into Germany they were £64,000,000, whereas in 1902 the imports into the United Kingdom were £185,000,000 and into Germany £128,000,000, an increase of £20,000,000 in the case of the United Kingdom and of £64,000,000 in the case of Germany, or a difference between 13 per cent and 100 per cent. Let them take the figures in regard to the United States of America and France. In 1883 they were for the United States of America £40,000,000, and in 1902 £55,000,000, an increase of 37 per cent., while in France they rose from £96,000,000 in 1883, to £114,000,000 in 1902, an increase of 19 per cent. Germany and the United States had developed enormously since 1870, and if the increase was maintained we should become a third-rate power. In 1880 the United States produced 67,998,000 tons of coal and 7,120,000 tons of iron, whereas in 1905 she produced 328,102,000 tons of coal and 44,054,000 tons of iron. Germany, in 1880, produced 46,974,000 tons of coal and 7,239,000 tons of iron, while in 1905 she produced 121,298,000 tons of coal and 23,444,000 tons of iron. The United Kingdom, in 1880, produced 146,060,000 tons of coal and 14,591,000 tons of iron, tons of coal and produced 236,129,000 whereas, in 1905, 18,026,000 tons of iron. He wanted to know if hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite thought that exports were the test. [Cries of "No."] He agreed that they were not, but that would seem to be the view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because the right hon. Gentleman had pointed to the extraordinary character of our exports as compared with those of Germany and the United States. Exports were not the final test of trade. Inside the circle of trade in this country we had a small circle representing the agricultural interest and a large circle representing the manufacturing interest. We had to go out into the world in order to secure our food, of which we did not produce sufficient quantities, and to get our raw material which also we did not produce in sufficient quantities. We were, therefore, bound to show immense exports or to show nothing. But the position was quite different in Germany and the United States, and when the right hon. Gentleman used the argument that the United States exports were smaller than ours he did not do credit to his knowledge, because the United States had within itself a huge circle for the production of raw material, and therefore her exports would be no test whatever of her wealth. If they were to judge the United States by her exports she would appear to be a poor country, but, as a matter of fact, employment and wages there were high while our skilled workers were not increasing in number. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite were in the habit of saying that what we ought to do was to tax nothing, but according to the figures for 1904 it appeared that while the United States admitted free of duty £91,000,000 worth of goods, with a duty she let in £105,000,000 worth of goods, while she admitted in raw material £58,000,000. Roughly speaking, therefore, the United States under her system let in between £200,000,000 and £300,000,000 worth of goods. Coming to the figures with regard to emigration in the different countries, he found that in 1894, the amonnt of emigration was in Germany 26 per 10,000 of the population. In 1903 it had fallen to 6 per 10,000. In England, however, in 1894, the figure was 9·7 per 10,000, but in 1903 it had increased to 34 per 10,000. [AN HON. MEMBER: It is not true.] The hon. Gentleman was not entitled to say that what he said was not true, as he had taken his figures from accurate sources, and he was illustrating what Bismark and Caprivi had said, that it was better to export goods than men. The Blue-book of the Board of Trade showed that our skilled workmen were not increasing, but there had been an increase in those engaged in merchanting and in clerical work. But no country could live by merchanting, and unless we could keep up our manufacturing standard we were not in a satisfactory condition commercially.

Mr. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) asked whether the hon. Gentleman could discuss the whole question of tariff reform on the Report stage of the Finance Bill ?

*Mr. SPEAKER said that, as he understood it, the hon. Gentleman was challenging everything, or nearly everything, in the Finance Bill, and contending that our whole fiscal system was wrong. Therefore, he thought he was in order.

Sir GILBERT PARKER said that his contention was that our export system was not satisfactory, and before he passed on to other matters he would wish hon. Members to ask themselves whether they were satisfied with the conditions of our trade with Germany. Our total exports to Germany were about £40,000,000. Of this about £30,000,000 was represented by gold, £11,000,090 ; coal, £4,000,000 ; skins and hides, £1,740,000 ; silver raw and in bars, £1,000,000 ; sheep and goat skins, £775,000 ; fresh fish, £350,000 ; caoutchouc and gutta percha, £1,200,000 ; salted herrings, £800,000 ; sheeps' wool, £850,000 ; tin, raw, £600,000 ; iron, raw, £600,000 ; yarn, £6,500,000 ; cotton and woollen fabrics, £900,000 ; and machinery, £700,000. The President of the Board of Trade the other day stated in reply to a Question that the imports into the United Kingdom, consigned from Germany, of raw materials and articles mainly manufactured was, in 1905, £3,896,000, while the exports of the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom to Germany was £4,458,000. The imports into the United Kingdom of articles from Germany wholly or mainly maunfactured was £38,057,000, while the exports of this class of article from the United Kingdom to Germany was £21,635,000. The total German exports to this country were about £49,000,000, and his point was that that was not the kind of trade exchange with which we ought to be satisfied, especially when it was considered that in addition millions of pounds worth of German goods reached us through Holland and Belgium. It was a fair trade exchange that tariff reformers were asking for and it was that fair trade exchange that the Colonies were prepared to give us, because for every pound of stuff that we bought from them they bought a pound of stuff from us. Hon. Gentlemen opposite suggested that the Colonies wanted to get something out of the Mother Country [Cries of "Hear, hear."] That was utterly untrue. Canada gave us a preference because she wanted to trade with us. She believed that it was better to send her ships to this country loaded with goods and bring them back full instead of having to charter other ships to go to Germany, both sets of ships coming back comparatively empty. All these considerations had moved him that afternoon to speak as strongly as he had done, and he hoped not inconsiderately, concerning the Finance Bill which the right hon. Gentleman had introduced. Tariff reformers did not want to build a ring fence round the Empire or restrict freedom of trade, but they wanted to secure freer markets for our goods. The Liberal Party had their ideals, which were evolutionary and social. They on that side, however, believed that their ideal of preference was nearer to the spirit of the time than the ideals of hon. Gentlemen opposite. They wanted a more ethical form of trade between this and other countries. Their ideal could not be assessed by Board of Trade returns and was in accordance with the utterances of the first Lord Elgin. He believed that if the first Lord Elgin had been at the Conference this year a different reply would have been given to the Premiers, who came here to ask for reciprocal advantages for the common good of the Empire. The answer was not the answer they desired. He believed the answer they desired would come.

*Mr. BYLES said he was not going to follow the hon. Gentleman in his tariff reform speech, but he desired that the exact facts should be elicited as to what Lord St. Aldwyn had stated in reference to the corn tax. He thought that Lord St. Aldwyn in his first speech had expressed his belief that the corn tax would not affect the price of bread, but in a later speech which he (Mr. Byles) had had the advantage of hearing the noble Lord deliver at Manchester, he said he had made a mistake, he acknowledged that the corn-tax had raised the price of bread, and he withdrew from his position.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: In certain places.

*MR. BYLES said that was his sole reason for interrupting the hon. Gentleman. He had risen, however, for the specific purpose of referring to the sugar tax, on which there had already been a formal debate and a division, and there had been a great deal of talk about pledge breakers. He believed that as many as 156 pledge breakers were, it was said, to be found on his side of the House, and the Chief Whip of the Conservative Party had thought fit further to expose the iniquities of these 156 members by writing a letter to *The Times* newspaper, which letter was replied to from the Ministerial side, as he thought very adequately. At any rate, his own withers were unwrung, and he fancied that many of his colleagues would say the same thing. It was surely a stretch of rhetoric to call a person a pledge breaker because he had expressed a desire to repeal the sugar tax and then refused to assent to a specific Amendment to deal with a portion of the tax. It was well known that a mouse was fond of toasted cheese, but the mouse was a great fool to go into the trap to get it. The Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool was practically a trap set for supporters of the Government. Sugar was also used sometimes to bait a trap, but he, at any rate, was too old a Parliamentary bird to walk into the trap set for them by the ingenious young gentleman who represented the Walton Division. With regard to the Budget itself he would not offer more than one or two observations. He regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not seen his way to deal with the sugar tax, with indirect taxes, the breakfast duties, and so forth. They had to wait for another year before they could get a fulfilment of that object. He had said to his constituents, as doubtless had many other hon. Members to theirs, that he disapproved of these taxes. For his part he regarded indirect imposts as a tax upon the wealth makers of the country, a tax upon the rations of the people, and he held that something ought to be done to prevent money from being so obtained. They should take the necessary resources for carrying on the government of the country out of the wealth when it was produced. They lived in hope, and were looking forward to the next Budget. They had been told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this Budget was part of a triple Budget, and they must wait until the picture was complete before they judged it. He would endeavour to possess his mind in patience until next spring, but he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would lay to heart the warnings which he had got from Radicals on that side of the House, who did not believe in breakfast table duties or indirect taxation, but who did believe in taking all the resources of the country from the accumulated wealth, from the land revenues and the land values of the country, leaving the worker, especially the poor worker, free, or nearly free from taxation.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said that the question of the taxation of sugar was a very important one to the country. He did not think that anyone would state that what his hon. friend had said in regard to the sugar tax was not justified. He had listened with great pleasure to the Budget statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He believed it to be the clearest statement he had ever heard during all the years he had been in that House, and if he might be allowed to say so, he thought the Budget which he had introduced and now actually passed was one of the boldest ever proposed by the Liberal Party. If a Unionist Government had brought in a Budget of this kind and passed it into law, he was sure that a good many strong things would have been said against those "wicked Tories." An hon. Gentleman below the gangway the other day had asserted that as far as relief of taxation was concerned, people with £40 a week would get relief under this Bill, while the man with £1 a week would get no relief whatever.

Why was this Budget passed when so many people represented by hon. Members opposite were not in favour of it? The reason was that the Liberal Members could boast of very strong Party feeling. In the last election the constituencies had to vote on very large issues, and among them there was hardly any of a larger character than that with regard to taxes on food. In his own constituency all the votes he had given on tea and sugar in the last one or two Parliaments were published, so that every constituent might have the opportunity of learning what a wicked man he was. When one heard the two cries: "Vote for so-and-so, and old-age pensions," and "Vote for so-and-so, and no taxes on food," one wondered how old-age pensions were to be granted without taxes on food. There must be a considerable amount of feeling in regard to the pledges which had been given. He could not say how definite those pledges were to a certain association, but it was said that a number of members had stated that they were willing to vote against the sugar tax. It was natural for an ordinary person to believe that when a Member said he would vote against taxation on sugar, he would vote against it on the first occasion, just as he would vote against any Bill on the first occasion if he had pledged himself to do so. The statements made in regard to the big and little loaf had a great effect at the last general election, but most of them realised now, and Liberal Members realised it more now than they did at the general election, that we were providing an enormous amount of our revenue out of the taxes on food, and drink, and tobacco. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in reply to a question the other day, said that the total revenue in the last financial year derived from the taxes on food and kindred articles was £64,839,260. Yet they heard at the general election that a small tax on corn, which could not possibly amount to a revenue of more than £2,500,000 to £3,000,000, would mean ruin to this country. He sincerely hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might be able to take the tax off sugar, but he did not think that the hon. Member for Bolton the other day had any right to say that the right hon. Gentleman was going to do it, because they had heard no definite pledge from the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to the question. There was no doubt that the taxes on food, drink, and tobacco were paid mainly by the masses of the people of the country; but it might be said that drink stood out of the category. That, of course, was perfectly true, but, so far as the actual cost to the workman was concerned, it did not matter very much whether he paid a small tax on a glass of beer or a small tax on his bread. Before the general election the Chancellor of the Exchequer said in reference to these different taxes that they offered a wide field for revision. The present Lord Chancellor had said that the tax on tea was the most cruel of taxes, because it fell on the poorest people of the community. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said the tea tax ought not to be resorted to except in great emergency. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said that these taxes were put on for the war, and ought to be taken off now the war was over. In trying to find some justification for the statement of hon. Gentlemen at the election, he thought it might be said that they had every reason to believe that an effort would be made to take off those taxes. With regard to old-age pensions, he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown the utmost wisdom in the action he had taken in reference to the Sinking Fund, and it would do something to uphold the credit of the British people. The Blue-books issued the other day showed more than ever the difficulty of dealing with the old-age pensions question, because many people did not realise that it was absolutely essential that any old-age pension scheme should be carried out upon strictly business principles. It had been stated by one of the members of the Labour Party that any pension of less than 10s. a week would be of little value. [A LABOUR MEMBER: Who said that?] It was said by the hon. Member for Woolwich. The cost of the administration of the Poor Law of this country stood at £15,000,000 per annum. He regretted that they had not had an opportunity of discussing the Local Government Board Vote during the present year. It was rather difficult to discover how far old-age pensions would increase or decrease Poor Law expenditure, but assuming that there were 3,250,000 old people entitled to a pension of 10s. per week, the amount of money required would be £84,500,000, whilst for a pension of 5s. per week, the sum of £42,250,000 would be required. Consequently the right hon. Gentleman could not possibly next year bring in a universal old-age pension scheme. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find some means of getting over the difficulty, because he believed such a scheme would be in the interests of the country.

*MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that as one of the supporters of the present Government he could not look upon this Finance Bill with unmixed satisfaction. He was elected mainly by the votes of poor men, and he was sorry the Bill gave no direct relief of taxation for them. The relief it gave to possessors of incomes between £160 and £2,000 a year would be welcome to those classes. But not many of them dwelt in cottages where most of his constituents lived. He had hoped for the repeal of the sugar duty. That was the most hurtful to the poor of all the new taxes put on by their Tory predecessors. He was aware that it brought in £6,000,000, collected largely out of the sugar basins of the poor. That was a large sum, but he had hoped that it would have been possible to reduce by that amount the bloated military and naval expenditure imposed upon them by the late Government—the most reckless and prodigal Government which this generation had seen. The present Parliament would, he hoped, insist upon such or a larger reduction soon. In ten years of the late Government's administration, they actually added between £40,000,000 and £50,000,000 a year to our military and naval expenditure! And this, not to keep pace with other nations, but to force the pace on them! They added in those ten years nearly twice as much as Italy, France, Germany, and Russia put together, as was shown by Lord Avebury in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine* of November, 1905. He hoped large reductions would be possible before next year's Budget. He welcomed the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this was a foundation Budget upon which to build others, that it was only one of a series. He hoped it would be a long series. He appealed to the Government to make it so. This was the third Liberal Government he had helped to bring into power. The first muddled them into a dissolution in six short months, the second in three years, and since he had sat in the first of these Parliaments there had been three Tory Parliaments each lasting for six years. He asked the present Government to be as wise in this respect as their Tory predecessors had been, and not to throw office away. The people had given the present Liberal Government the largest majority any Government had ever had. He was sure that it was the wish of those who sent them to the House of Commons that they should use for the full six years allowed by the Constitution the power thus put into their hands. They wished and expected them to do it. Another place could not interfere with them in this matter. The House of Lords would be glad indeed if they could make them dissolve. Neither, happily, could they interfere with their finance. Never did the nation's finances more need remodelling. They—the Liberal Members—looked to their leaders to enable them to help those who sent them to Parliament not in three or four only, but in six Finance Bills. As one of a series, there were many good points in this Bill. It preserved and remodelled the income-tax. If fairly assessed, that was the best tax we had. Their incomes were the real measure of the people's power to pay. If they adopted the plan outlined by the hon. Member for North Paddington of a graduated income-tax, as he showed ample means were available for all social reforms, and without hurting anybody. The promise of old-age pensions to start next year was the feature of this year's Budget which he most welcomed. What joy, what comfort would the starting of them bring. In every hamlet, in every street, almost in every cottage the starting of them would put new songs into the mouths of the aged poor, and cause their hearts to sing for joy. Let the pensions be immediate, unconditional, universal. Happy the Chancellor, and happy the Parliament which gave this great boon to the people. He hoped they would see it begun next year. In conclusion, he wished to congratulate the Chancellor on being in office at such a time as the present. They had entered on a period of great industrial activity. Coal, iron, cotton, wool, meat, all their great industries were prospering. Why? Rising prices had caused this great activity. And what had caused rising prices? No doubt mainly the wonderful inflow of new gold from mines in various parts of the earth. Great increases in the supply of the precious metals had always produced rising prices and great industrial prosperity. It was so after the discovery of America and the opening of the silver mines of Potosi. The gold discoveries in California and Australia, which some of them could remember, as they proceeded brought prosperity to all the civilised nations, and not only the free-trade nations, but the protectionist nations as well shared in the great prosperity which accompanied that until then unprecedented outflow of gold. In twenty years following 1849, when the discoveries in California and Australia began, the whole stock of gold in the possession of mankind was doubled. The highest production in any one year during these discoveries was £36,000,000. He was happy to know that the production of gold last year was no less than £82,000,000! These golden sovereigns fresh from the Mint had come rolling into all the avenues of industry of the nations of the earth, and as they had flowed in they had stimulated industry of every kind and caused a large increase in prices. What economists called the "index number," which was based on the wholesale prices of forty commodities, had risen 25 per cent. in the last ten years. A much greater rise in the coming ten was almost a certainty. The inflow of the fertilising streams of new money had lifted up the prices of different commodities so that the producers of them had been stirred into fresh activity, there had been increased employment, and wages had gone and were still going up. The finances of the country could not but share in the beneficial effects of this great inflow of new gold. What Budgets Mr. Gladstone had in the fifties and sixties of last century while the gold production was proceeding! He used to reduce taxes and take off taxes and still the revenue increased by leaps and bounds. That was a happy example of what we were now probably about again to see. The Californian and Australian stream was but a tiny rill in comparison with the river of gold that was flowing in now. The average of the twenty years during those discoveries was considerably under thirty millions a year, but last year no fewer than eighty-two millions of new gold flowed in to fertilise the nations. And there was every prospect, indeed almost the certainty, of the continuance and increase of this huge supply for many years yet to come. The world had never seen anything comparable to the golden prospect now opening before us. Happy was the Chancellor who was in office at such a time as this. Here, too, was a Parliament more eager for social reform than any that had ever before sat. And with the inflow of the new rivers of sovereigns here were the means coming in sight to enable these reforms to be carried out. The Chancellor and Parliament might rejoice together in the golden era now opening to bless mankind.

*MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) thanked the hon. Member for Woodbridge for the compliment he had paid to the Conservative Party in the contrast which he had drawn between it and the Liberal Party. The hon. Member had made what could only be regarded as a startling statement when heard from the Liberal side of the House; he stated that rising prices were good for this country, and that they stimulated industry. He could hardly reconcile that statement with the arguments used by hon. Members opposite that the effect of tariff reform would be to raise prices and to cripple industry.

MR. EVERETT said he spoke of rising prices flowing from the great increase of new money.

*MR. LEVERTON HARRIS said he always understood that those who were interested in free trade maintained that rising prices, whether they came from an influx of gold or from import duties, were a burden on working men, and that they retarded rather than stimulated trade. Those who had followed the course of the debates on the Finance Bill must have observed that the criticisms so far as they had come from that side of the House, had been principally directed towards the narrowness of the basis of taxation—the limited sources from which the national revenue was derived, and the necessity for expanding these, and effecting what was commonly known as a broadening of the basis of taxation. On the Second Reading of the Bill his right hon. friend the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, moved an Amendment with the object of broadening the basis of taxation. If to-day he did not go far into the tariff reform and free trade controversy, it was not because he at all condoned the economic fallacies which this Bill contained, but because he believed there were other important and pressing considerations which were worthy of the attention of this House. He was inclined to say that no Chancellor of the Exchequer in modern times had presented to the House, and asked it to pass, so dangerous a Budget as the present. In the past it had been the tradition and the practice of Chancellors of the Exchequer in what were known as the piping times of peace, to allow some margin for the expansion of the revenue which could be drawn upon to meet any great crisis or national emergency which might occur and involve us in war, or preparation for war, or even the fear of war. In dealing with the income-tax, Chancellor of the Exchequer after Chancellor of the Exchequer had laid the greatest stress upon the importance of its being a tax that could be expanded to provide for rapid supplies, in order to initiate and carry to a successful conclusion any great or prolonged military or naval operations. He would respectfully commend any hon. Gentleman interested in the subject to those portions of the Budget speeches of Mr. Gladstone in 1853 and 1864, which dealt with the subject of the income-tax. In both the Budgets—certainly in the second if his memory served him correctly — Mr. Gladstone went so far as to doubt whether the income-tax should be a permanent tax, and laid it down that it was a tax which ought to exist principally as one which could be drawn upon in emergency. There was no more unfortunate position for a country to be in than to know that it was impossible to defend its rights or shores without inflicting wholesale disaster or universal bankruptcy and ruin upon its finance, industry, and commerce. Not only was that a profoundly dangerous situation to be in, but it was a situation the mere knowledge of which invited from hostile and other nations aggression and attack. The mere knowledge that we were weak was a temptation to enforce claims and exact concessions. Were we not in this very situation to-day? What were the facts of the case? If we were suddenly involved in war there were only three ways in which sufficient sums of money could be obtained for the carrying of a large war to a successful conclusion. It might be done as was done by certain other great nations by having a war chest, which, associated with a large gold reserve, enabled the nation to draw money speedily and rapidly to carry on warlike operations. But we had not a war chest, and we had not a large gold reserve. Secondly, if we had well-established credit, we might borrow the money in the markets of the country, or the markets of the world. But could we borrow? He ventured to say that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find it a difficult problem if he wanted to raise £20,000,000 in the London market. Thirdly, if we had an elastic and wide system of taxation, the taxes could be so increased as to obtain a considerable sum of money to start and carry on operations. Under our present system of free trade our sources of taxation were saturated. We could not increase the burden. The income-tax was at 1s. That might be justifiable in time of war. He thought everyone would admit that it was an oppressive tax in time of peace. It was true that during the South African War it reached 1s. 3d., and that, he thought, was the highest point it had ever reached since its re-imposition in 1842, with the exception of a short period during the

Crimea, when it touched 1s. 4d. If the tax was raised to-day to 1s. 4d. the additional 4d. would only produce £10,000,000 more revenue in the year, but that amount in time of war was practically nothing. We had a higher taxation of food than had any other country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in answer to his hon. friend the Member for Darlington had stated that it amounted to £65,000,000 if tobacco and spirits were included. The tax on tea meant an annual contribution of between 2s. 6d. and 2s. 7d. from every man, woman, and child in the country; and he thought that this justified the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he told them the other day that tea had now become a luxury. It had been stated that 156 hon. Members had vigorously condemned the sugar tax in their private capacity, on the grounds that it was burdensome on trade and pressed very hardly on the poor consumers. But they had inconsistently supported it as a party machine. The party machine, however, would only work once in such cases. He thought they might take it for granted that next year a large part of the sugar tax would be remitted, if it was not abolished altogether. It had been said that the schedule of the death duties might be increased, but they could not control the death-rate of the millionaires of this country at will. In fact every tax which could be imposed under a free trade policy was to-day imposed, and pressed heavily on all classes. He had no doubt that some hon. Gentlemen would entirely discredit that statement. Some would dissent because they might think that they had got the duties on wines, spirits, and beer to fall back upon, and that those duties could be increased in time of war. But experience had shown that if they relied on that source they relied on a broken reed. Then others said that land and mining royalties would prove a source of revenue beyond the dreams of avarice. But in time of war, when foreign supplies of food and iron ore were endangered, any tax on land or mining royalties would raise prices and contribute to and aggravate the actual crisis. The situation would not, to his mind, be so serious if our credit was unimpaired. But what was the condition of our credit? Consols to-day stood at 82½—18 below par—he believed the lowest they had ever touched since 1812. He believed that if anyone connected with the City were asked he would say that if one went into the money market and tried to sell £1,000,000 of Consols, he either could not do it, or he would depress the price of Consols to such a point as to start a panic. But if the Government went into the market and tried to borrow £20,000,000 on Consols or any other Government security they would be imperilling the whole commercial fabric of the nation. [Cries of "Oh!"] He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself whether it would not be a very serious venture if he tried to borrow £20,000,000? That was a position which he regretted. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to be rather inclined to take matters very lightly. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that this was only a temporary phase which they need not trouble themselves very much about; that they need not write down their securities, with the favourable hope, that like Micawber, something better would turn up. At the opening of an insurance company's new buildings on 10th July, the right hon. Gentleman who was present gave some startling advice, but like most sanguine persons he did not prove to be an expert tipster. The right hon. Gentleman then said—

> "He did not know if that insurance company were engaged in the gloomy proceedings of writing down—a practice which he thought was very much to be deprecated unless taken at comparatively long intervals, and with full consideration, not only of the past and the present, but of the probabilities and prospects of the future."

Such sentiments savoured of the Bankruptcy Court. Had this not been the excuse of every bankrupt and speculator? The right hon. Gentleman continued—

> "A great deal of nonsense had been talked and still more nonsense had been written in the course of the last twelve months on the supposed depreciation of our national credit. He thought, and he spoke with some knowledge of the case, that they might fairly consider that in this matter we had touched bottom, and that the upward process had begun, and that it would continue."

On the 10th July Consols stood at 84⅛; to-day they were at 82½—a very considerable fall. The fact that our securities had depreciated was not a myth. If examples were needed of the difficulty of borrowing money he might quote the East Indian Railway Company—which enjoyed the guarantee of the Indian Government both as regarded interest and capital. They recently asked for a loan, but failed to raise more than one-sixth from the public and had to go to the underwriters and place the balance at a discount. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that they dare not go to the market. No Irish Land Stock was to be publicly issued this year. The market would not take it. Then there was the Transvaal Loan of £5,000,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer knew perfectly well that if he tried to raise £5,000,000 he would have difficulty in getting it except at a very low price, and he therefore proposed to issue it in driblets and on Treasury Bills. They were in a position of very great danger to the country. Where were they to obtain supplies should they be suddenly placed in the unfortunate position of supplies being absolutely necessary for the reorganisation and recreating of our attenuated Army and for mobilising our skeleton Fleet, and the provision of ammunition, food, and transport, which were necessary for vigorously pressing a long and arduous war? If they were to attempt to raise any very large sum of money by way of loan, he ventured to say that such a crisis would be produced as would imperil our position. They could not raise taxation without disturbing the free trade policy of the country to which they were so wedded. At the last general election the great policy of hon. Gentlemen opposite was that there was to be a large reduction of taxation. They had heard a good deal about a free breakfast table, although he did not understand what it was, for at present everything on the breakfast table was taxed except bread. That was hardly a definition which carried out the idea of a free breakfast table, which had been so freely promised by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The free breakfast table had its sugar, coffee, and tea all taxed. In fact the tax on tea involved a contribution per head six times as high as the contribution paid on foreign wheat and flour during the time the corn tax was in operation.

MR. ASQUITH said that the hon. Gentleman did not observe that in the one case the whole of the added price went into the Exchequer and in the other it did not.

*MR. LEVERTON HARRIS said that that was a matter of dispute between the free traders and the tariff reformers into which there was not at present time to enter. As a matter of fact the Chancellor of the Exchequer assured the House that the penny he took off tea last year did not affect the consumer. The statement he had made was perfectly correct. He said the contribution per head of the population of this country to the taxation on tea was 2s. 6d. or 2s. 7d., and that the contribution on wheat and flour coming from foreign countries during the time that the corn tax was in force was 5½d. per annum. He admitted that something had been done since the opposite Party came into power to reduce taxation, and that there had been a reduction of £2,000,000, but having regard to the fact that it was only about one-sixtieth of the annual revenue collected by taxation it was after all a very paltry sum. Great efforts were being made, thousands of men were being dismissed from Woolwich and cast adrift, the Army had been reduced by several battalions and other retrenchments made. But in spite of this if the Government intended to fulfil their promise and to devise and erect a system of old-age pensions which was not a mere sham, if they wished to maintain our present Army and Navy even at the reduced *status* at which they now were, if they adhered to free trade doctrines, to what source were they going to turn to provide for large and immediate sums of money should they have to find them for the purpose of defending our rights and maintaining our prestige?

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) said that as a new comer he was surprised to see hon. Members come here with carefully prepared platform orations, and speak at great length on the subject of tariff reform, and he was amazed at the waste of time. Unionist speakers had spoken of tariff reform as if it were in the interests of the workers as a class, and they appeared to think that they knew the interests of the workers better than those who were sent to Parliament to represent them. The reason the workers refused to countenance the taxation of imported commodities was that they realised that the organised workers of other countries where protective duties existed were strenuously resisting that form of taxation. They had realised through their visits and experiences in the United States and Germany that the taxation of imported commodities did not mean permanence of employment for the workers, but was simply the means of enabling the employers to increase the price of the commodities which the workers had manufactured. The industrial conflicts which took place in America between the workers and the employers were far more violent and more frequent than the industrial conflicts in this country, yet America was held up as a model by the tariff reformers. If the organised workers were not suspicious of tariff reform for other reasons the war chest of the Tariff Reform League would make them so. They did not regard the taxation of imported commodities as a cure for the social evils in this or any other country. They went on first principles and said that the transfer of a commodity across an ocean or a frontier did not enhance its value but, on the contrary, depreciated it. They stood for international reciprocity, and the discussion between the organised workers at the international conferences centred upon how to get rid of these tariffs. The working class movement in the United States was against the tariff, because while they had higher wages and the climate demanded a higher standard of living, the worker found that he had to pay double the price for the commodity he manufactured than it could be obtained for in this country. In Germany they had protested against the tariff again and again because they were convinced that the taxation of imported commodities was absolutely pernicious. The Labour Party were not satisfied with the Finance Bill; they had expected much more from the strongest Government of modern times. They had expected the Government to put forward old-age pensions, and they believed that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had forced the problem through the difficulty would have been easily solved. Although it might be regarded as an extravagant proposal they believed that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer found it difficult to get new sources ot taxation he should recognise the necessity of putting on landed property the tax which the industrial classes paid to-day; there should also be a tax on land values and upon unearned incomes. If he were Chancellor of the Exchequer he would be prepared to put a graduated income tax upon incomes over £1,000. If that were done the problem of old-age pensions could be solved in less than two years. He believed it would be to the advantage of the country if the breakfast table were emancipated not only by the repeal of the sugar tax, but also by the graduation of the tax on tea. The Labour Party were going to keep up the campaign for old-age pensions both in that House and outside it, and if they could rot convert the Cabinet they would endeavour to convert the constituencies that sent them to the House. That was a point on which they disagreed with the Government, but that disagreement would never lead them to tariff reform. The tariff reform they required was the removal of the railway tariff and the removal of the tariff on people living on their own land. If those two tariffs were removed we could compete successfully with any country in the world.

*MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton) said that if the finances of the country were in such a lamentable condition as the hon. Member for Stepney suggested, the best thing to dowas to reduce the indebtedness of the country, and he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the way he had dealt with that question. The right hon. Gentleman had last year reduced the debt by £13,750,000, which he had said was to be a permanent reduction. That was true, but it was not quite so good a reduction as it appeared at first sight, because the right hon. Gentleman had to make allowance for something like £4,000,000 net expended under Works Acts, which made the actual reduction of debt last year, £10,000,000. The point he desired to put to the House was the way in which the right hon. Gentleman had dealt with the debt. Everybody agreed that it was absolutely necessary that the unfunded debt should be largely reduced; that the burden of the unfunded debt had been far too heavy. Five or six years ago it was something like £78,000,000, but he was glad to see that the right hon. Gentleman had since then reduced it to £52,000,000. That was an enormous and necessary improvement, because it not only released a large amount of "short money" which could be better employed in trade, but it also created a resource in times of emergency. The question now was whether the time was not opportune for buying up a large portion of the funded debt. The unfunded debt was not entirely a floating debt. It included the war loan, which was borrowed for ten years, but it was mainly made up of Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills. The former the right hon. Gentleman had reduced to £19,000,000, and the latter from £31,000,000 to £13,750,000. He had reduced them more than half. Now that the right hon. Gentleman had reduced the unfunded debt by so much, was not the time opportune for taking in hand the reduction of the funded debt? Treasury Bills ought only to be issued in order to finance the Chancellor of the Exchequer during the lean portion of the year. At the end of the financial year when the Exchequer was full, the right hon. Gentleman ought to pay off the whole of the Treasury Bills and start afresh with the new financial year. Of course in these matters regard must be had to the time through which the country was passing, and he suggested that under the present circumstances there was great advantage to be obtained in buying up Consols. He admitted that it might be cheaper at the moment to buy up some other loan, such as the war loan, but after all, the war loan could only rise to par, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer could only make a small amount by reducing that loan. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman should speculate in finance, but this was not speculating, it was taking a long view of the future. The effect of buying Consols would be to raise the price of Consols by several millions, and looking at the matter from that point of view the right hon. Gentleman would improve the national credit, and if he raised the price of Consols, he would be able to float at a better price the new Transvaal Loan. The right hon. Gentleman would also be able to help the new Irish stock. He believed it would be a very great advantage to take Consols in hand, and leave the unfunded debt alone for a time. We were now on the top of a wave of prosperity, with the result that a great deal of money was wanted for all kinds of purposes, and that was one of the reasons for the low price of Consols at the present moment. They saw a great deal of money seeking employment in the trade of the country, which eventually would seek a resting place in high class securities. With the trade of the country not likely to continue in its present state of prosperity we were sure to see, as in the past, a considerable rise in the price of Consols, and the right hon. Gentleman would be wise to take this opportunity of redeeming a larger sum than £2,000,000 in Consols this year. He hoped they would hear from the right hon. Gentleman that he would invest more.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer must acknowledge that where a man in the course of the year, in making up his accounts, could say that he had been defrauded by having paid a larger amount of income-tax than his profit showed he was liable to pay, there was a cause of complaint which should be remedied. He hoped that in his future Budgets the right hon. Gentleman would consider that question. Another point was as regarded the deductions from income-tax. Some years ago Lord Goschen pointed out that he could not accede to a demand for an allowance for depreciation of capital out of revenue, because depreciation of capital was just as much a point with the professional man as with the manufacturer; brains were the capital of the professional man, and no allowance was made for loss of brain power—the man went on until his brain failed in his old age. But he was glad now to note that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was making an allowance for depreciation of brains by giving the earners of income below £2,000

3d. in the £. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to put the depreciation of capital on the same basis in regard to individuals and limited companies. He thought he was right in saying that the question of the depreciation of capital had arisen entirely through a mistake or misconception of the description in the original Income-Tax Act. In some way or other the question of income and capital was so stated in the original Act that the Judges had founded their decisions upon it that they could not depreciate capital in dealing with income. Therefore it now arose that they paid income-tax on a set of profits which they could not consider as profits for any other purpose except income-tax. If the right hon. Gentleman would refer to what Sir Henry Primrose had said he would see that the whole foundation of the difference between income and profits arose from the way in which the original Act was framed. If a man were charged on his true profits, made on a proper basis of calculation—of course, paying the tax on reserves—they would do a great deal to make the income-tax more acceptable, while it would be a better reserve in time of war and for the purposes of the Government. He welcomed the depreciation made on behalf of the trader, and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would see his way to extend it further so as to make the tax unexceptionable in every way. Then, as regarded the Local Taxation Account, he was very much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for noting his views on that point, and he would particularly ask him, when he was considering the tax on motor cars, to keep that tax specifically for the purpose of improving the roads, laying the dust, and minimising the nuisances which motor cars created. In regard to the first part of Customs and Excise, he was not quite so well pleased with the way in which the taxation under the Bill arose. He had listened with considerable interest to the speech of the hon. Member below the gangway, who desired to apply to labour and wages a sort of tariff reform, or the very fullest protection. What he and those who thought with him urged was that the same thing should be applied to the industries of this country which, besides the high wages they paid, had also to bear heavy rates and taxes. He and many others had pleaded for relief as regards the tax on tea, coffee, sugar, and other articles of food, and he thought they had done a little better than many hon. Gentlemen opposite, for they had carried out their election pledges by their votes, while hon. Members opposite who had made promises of a similar kind had not carried them out when it came to a question of voting. His own view of the matter was this—he could not see why taxes should be placed on food when there were manufactured articles on which taxes could be levied. He instanced the case of cash registers, which came exclusively from America. He did not think there was a single one made in this country. Why should these things not be taxed? In Germany they had put a duty on these cash registers, with the result that the Americans had erected works in that country. Therefore he thought we might rightly assume that if we put a duty on cash registers an industry would also be created in this country, and we should have part of that duty, and part of the wages received from the employers. That was the position he had always taken up. He objected to taxation on food, which was the only basis of the present Budget so far as concerned Customs and Excise, when it was possible to tax manufactured goods which came into this country. Taxation for revenue purposes, when accompanied by the statement that they should have no taxation which would beneficially affect any industry of this country, would be injurious, and ought not to be carried out without some alteration. Of course, he was aware that this principle did not entirely apply. It did not apply to the cocoa trade, the Cadburys and the Rowntrees, who made great sums of money; it did not apply to the Wills's, in the tobacco trade. They had taxation for revenue purposes applied for the benefit of specific trades; and what they desired to have instead of taxes on food, was taxation for revenue purposes on articles which were bought almost exclusively by the rich. The adoption of this plan would largely relieve the taxation on food, and make the poor man's expenses lighter and his position better. He regretted that in this particular Budget no effort was made in any way to relieve taxation on food, which amounted to £65,000,000 a year. Any suggestion to put a duty on manufactured articles brought to this country was jealously put aside, so that it should be impossible for any one industry to have an advantage over another. He thanked the Chancellor of the Exchequer on behalf of the traders and the manufacturers for the action he had taken, but as regards the taxation of food, he regretted that something more had not been done, especially as it would have led to the relief of the poor and unemployed.

*MR. ASQUITH: The hon. Member is the only speaker who has condescended to make any reference to the Bill under discussion. In regard to the income-tax I am glad the hon. Member has recognised what I am sure will be increasingly recognised as the position becomes more generally known—the efforts that have been made for many years past, since it became a necessarily permanent part of our system, to adjust its incidence in such a way as to conform to the elementary canons of equity and justice. With regard to his lamentations over the continuance of the tax on food, I demur to the figure of £65,000,000 as the revenue derived from food taxes. A large proportion of that sum consists of the taxation of alcohol, and no less than £14,000,000 comes from tobacco, so that when those two considerable items are taken off the taxation on food the real proportion is nothing like so large as that which the hon. Member suggested. But I may assure the hon. Member for Jarrow, who made such an admirable and suggestive speech, that nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to be able to deal, as I hope to be able to deal, with the taxation on the remaining articles of food before the time comes when I shall have to lay down my stewardship. By remitting the coal tax and taking a penny off tea last year, and by the reduction and readjustment of the income-tax this year, the Government have done something, at any rate, to redeem whatever pledges they gave at the general election. Another criticism germane to the Budget has reference to the provision for the reduction of debt. I spoke with a glow of optimism at a teetotal banquet the other day and expressed the hope that things are on the mend. I was not speaking of the trade of the country generally—for no one suggests that that is bad—but of the market in public securities, and I took the precaution of hinting that I was not to be supposed to be uttering any prediction as to the immediate future of the market. So much use has been made of my very innocent and guarded expression that I shall be very careful hereafter not to say anything at all of the future course of our markets and trades. But all the same I cannot allow it to be said that during the last two years, or during many years past, the national credit of this country has been seriously impaired. I agree that we cannot borrow on the enormous scale on which this country borrowed during and after the war — we cannot largely increase the expenditure, without a necessary depreciation in the market prices of what are called gilt-edged securities. One follows upon the other just as any sequence in the order of nature. When we add the abnormal prosperity of trade which has continued for more than three years, and which has put exceptional demands not only upon the currency but upon the whole machinery of credit of this country and the world, it is inconceivable that these so-called gilt-edged securities should remain at the level which they attained under conditions less happy. That is the whole explanation of the matter. But let my critics go to Berlin. There they will enjoy the double blessing of a protective tariff and a paternal Government. Yet anybody acquainted with finance who will compare our credit with the credit of the German Empire or of Prussia, not only as regards the prices at which securities stand, but also with reference to the amount of depreciation, will say that we do not come badly out of the comparison. We ought to deprecate boldly the discrediting and disparaging of the credit of our country. So far as I am concerned, I have done my best, so far as my opportunities have allowed —though I do not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer should meddle more than he can help with the money market—to keep off the market, while conditions are unfavourable for the flotation of new securities, such new ventures as it is in my power to control. Some of my City critics are under the mistaken idea that I can invest the Sinking Fund in Irish Land; which I can no more do than I can buy tram shares. The Sinking Fund is therefore out of the question. But what I have done is to allow the investment of savings banks' deposits in Irish Land stock. This, I think, is a right thing to do, and it has been most helpful that, instead of having a public issue of Land Stock this year, we should be authorising the National Debt Commissioners from time to time to apply such funds as are at their disposal to the purchase of stock. It will not go on the market at all. It will become one of their investments—and an excellent investment at the present range of prices—while the market will be relieved of an incubus which would have undoubtedly been most serious if there had been a public issue. I have done the same in regard to the proposed Transvaal loan. All the requirements of the Transvaal Government can be met during the next twelve months, by short-dated securities which I propose to provide. In both these respects I may fairly claim to have done what I can as Chancellor of the Exchequer to help over a very trying condition. As to the reduction of debt that has taken place, I have for the most part confined my operations to reducing the bulk of the floating debt. I feel that the outstanding Treasury Bills and Exchequer Bonds require to be reduced at the earliest opportunity. By having a great amount of floating obligations on the market the power of raising money in an emergency is crippled to a greater degree than in any other way. Therefore I think we were perfectly right to take the course we have taken. I speak cautiously in regard to matters of this kind, particularly in regard to the future, but I think I may go as far as to say that our floating obligations—I am not speaking of the War Loan, but of Treasury bills and Exchequer bonds—are just now reduced to a manageable sum. Certainly they ought to be further reduced, but I think they are now reduced substantially compared with what they were; and the alternative which lies before us will be between the War Loan, on the one hand, and Consols on the other. These are the only two other securities to which the Sinking Fund can be properly applied. I am not going to say—it would be very wrong if I did—what action will be taken, beyond saying that the considerations which have been brought forward by my hon. friend are very present to my mind, and that in matters of this kind one is guided very largely by the opinions of experts. The Government have at their disposal the advice of some of the most eminent men in the City, and the House may rely upon it that, following the general lines I have indicated, the Government will be guided by the advice which will be at our disposal. I do not think any other specific criticisms have been made on the proposals in the Bill. The hon. Members for Gravesend and Stepney, who very appropriately sit side by side, will forgive me if I do not go into the large question they raised as to the foundations of our fiscal system. The hon. Member for Gravesend said one thing of which I desire to take notice, because coming from him it comes from one of the high priests in the temple of tariff reform. I have often, in the course of the controversy, ventured to urge that you cannot have a system of tariff reform without taxing both food and raw material—and let me point out to my hon. friend the Member for Liverpool that it is no good talking about taxing luxuries which do not affect the daily life of the working man. That is not tariff reform. Tariff reform is founded on Colonial preference, and the taxation of luxuries is merely the fringe of the question—the essence of tariff reform consists in giving a preferential duty to the Colonies with regard to commodities which come to us from them, and the only things that come to us from the Colonies are food and raw materials. I have often argued that if you are going to give preference to the Colonies you must give preference on food and raw materials.

SIR GILBERT PARKER indicated dissent.

*MR. ASQUITH: The hon. Gentleman shakes his head. Food if you like, but raw materials never. The hon. Gentleman used the expression: "You place every stiver of the tax on raw material on the consumer." What an extraordinary revelation this of the minds of tariff reformers! If food comes from abroad and it is taxed, the foreigner pays the tax; but if raw material comes from abroad and it is taxed, the consumer pays the tax.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he qualified his statement by saying when raw material was not produced in this country and did not enter into competition.

*MR. ASQUITH: Very well, have it so. Is it not the same with food? What is true of one is true of the other. Even after listening to the admirable speeches those two apostles of tariff reform, I am still unable, as I have always been, to see why it should be perfectly good finance, consistent with all the rules of equity and polity, to put a tax on food, while it should be an abomination or an iniquity to put an tax on raw material. Economically, there is not a shadow of a shade of difference between the two. I apologise for making this short digression into the tempting field opened by those two hon. Gentleman. I do not think it is any more relevant to the Budget than any attack on the foundations of our fiscal system, which, of course, the hon. Gentlemen are entitled to make; and I agree there is no more constitutional opportunity than the third reading of the Finance Bill. It is my business simply to defend the proposals of the Government in the Bill, and I do not want to digress beyond the four corners of the measure itself, and I ask the House to give us an opportunity as soon as may be of reading it a third time.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): As to the measures the right hon. Gentleman has taken or is going to take in regard to the country's indebtedness, I am glad to find myself in hearty agreement with him. I must make two observations of a personal character. I do not remember that the right hon. Gentleman, when in Opposition, viewed the depreciation of our national credit with the vehemenence and indignation he has applied to it in the present Parliament, and I rather think that in defending himself he is necessarily drawn to defend the late Government from many of the strictures passed upon it by many hon. Gentlemen opposite. I entirely agree that in reducing the debt the first thing the right hon. Gentleman has to do is to reduce the dangerous, or at any rate the large, amount of the floating debt outstanding. I am not at all insensible to the arguments in favour of purchasing Consols at their present rate, with the possibility that they may at sometime or another have a considerable rise; but I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer was wise to resist that temptation, and, in the first place, to free his hands by reducing the amount of the floating debt, and to give himself a margin for any emergency that may arise. I am not quite certain that that process has gone so far as it ought to go; but I recognise that the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke guardedly on the subject, and, in deciding what he would do with the sinking fund, told the House that he would be guided by the judgment he may form after taking the best expert advice he can obtain. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also recalled to the House what he had done to keep off the market as a borrower during the currency of the present year. I have no word of criticism to offer as to the action he has taken in respect to Irish land stock or the Transvaal loan, except to express regret that his announcement in regard to the Transvaal loan came so late. If, when he first announced that it was the intention of the Government to guarantee the Transvaal loan, he had made the announcement he subsequently made, that the whole demand on the market this year would be a million of short-dated securities, I think he would have saved a great deal of disturbance and misunderstanding, and also some inconvenience and even loss.

MR. ASQUITH: I was most careful to state that I would not commit myself as to the time or manner of the issue.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman would not commit himself to anything. When people are in a state of uncertainty they are apt to fear the worst. It is not because he did not state that he would not bring out the loan in a particular month this year that I complain, but because he did not state what he subsequently stated, that he would only make a small demand on the money market, and that in the shape of short-dated Bills. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken not merely of the effect which the large demands for national expenditure have made on the money market, but also the great effect produced by the large increase in local indebtedness. That stands for a great deal in the deterioration of the price of gilt-edged securities, and this House is not wholly free from blame in the matter. No doubt many of the municipalities have been severely pressed by the check placed on their borrowing powers. I think such a check is useful, but I think also that the House should remember that it has its share of responsibility for what the municipalities have done. We are constantly imposing new duties upon them, and giving them new powers of borrowing for fresh objects. As long as the House proceeds on those lines you cannot expect that there will be a real check on the amount of loans raised by local authorities. That is a consideration which we ought to bear in mind in discussing the Budget as a whole. I think the most remarkable fact in the discussion of the present Budget is that I cannot recall to mind a single speech in the course of these debates in which the Budget has been heartily and wholly approved. From every quarter of the House criticism—either expressions of condemnation or expressions of regret that the Budget was not other than it is—have been heard, and even the Chancellor of the Exchequer has never pretended to express any hearty approval of the scheme of taxation embodied in it. That is rather a serious situation. Of the taxes which are now in force the right hon. Gentleman considers that the income-tax is too high, that the sugar tax ought to be abolished, and that the tea tax ought to be either abolished or reduced. At the same time the right hon. Gentleman announces that he has to make preparations for a large amount of new expenditure and that he can hold out no hope of a substantial reduction in the aggregate expenditure of the nation. What, then, is to be the future of our financial system? If we destroy the taxes which now exist, and if we refuse all opportunities which are offered for widening the basis of taxation by the introduction of new taxes, if new taxes are piled on while the present expenditure will be not only maintained but increased, the result will be that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will have to disappoint expectations. The right hon. Gentleman made a remarkable observation when he said that if we added to the taxation he had remitted the amount by which the expenditure had been reduced, it would be seen that he had done very well. But that is counting the money twice over. I think the right hon. Gentleman misapprehended what the hon. Member for Stepney had stated as to the amount of taxation by which he had relieved poor people. Surely my hon. friend was absolutely correct. It is true that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has repealed the coal tax, but I think I could make out a very good case for an argument that whoever gets the benefit of the repeal of the coal tax, it is the foreigner who must have taken the coal, and who must have been obliged to pay the additional tax. But putting that aside, when one considers the relief given to the taxpayers of this country, it is not the tax which is repealed, but the amount of money collected from the people which the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to look to. When one looks at the amount of money which the taxpayers have to find, even giving credit for the repeal of the coal tax, the relief is no more than what my hon. friend has stated. In my opinion, often expressed, and which I am not going to elaborate now, we cannot safely go on in this fashion. I have listened with very great interest to the speech of the hon. Member for Stepney. We welcome him as a tariff reformer, but my hon. friend's speech dealt with a subject which we ought to consider whether we are tariff reformers or not. Supposing a certain emergency were to arise involving increased expenditure, I do not think there is a Member of the House, whatever may be his opinion on tariff reform, who considers that within the limits of our existing taxation we have at present a satisfactory reserve. If we became involved in a great war, we would have to put on new taxes, or resort to old taxes, in order to secure a satisfactory reserve. To insure such a reserve, we must have existing taxes with existing machinery which has a margin on which one can meet a new demand. That is impossible on the present narrow basis of taxation, and for that reason, if for no other, I would be a tariff reformer and in favour of widening our system of taxation. The right hon. Gentleman has said that the essence of tariff reform is Colonial preference. I am not likely to underrate the importance of the relation of Colonial preference to tariff reform, but Colonial preference is not the only object we have in view. I am here to say that if no Colonial preference can be obtained, it would still be wise to alter our fiscal system for pure fiscal reasons, and in order to obtain an instrument of negotiation to assist us in getting better terms in the protective markets of the world. The less chance we have of Colonial preference the more important become the great Continental markets to us. This is largely owing to the increasing difficulty of entering those markets, and the increasing competition from the same quarter in neutral markets. I attach growing importance to Colonial preference. I am not going to argue now the effect of Colonial preference on political considerations in our dominions beyond the seas. I do not want to delay the debate. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer's observations seemed to imply that we on this side of the House could see no reason for any change in our fiscal system were it not for Colonial preference. I frankly admit that since I first studied the question of Colonial preference, in which I am much interested, I think it is quite as important from the aspect I have just indicated that we should have a change in our fiscal system as for any reason connected with preference to our Colonial possessions. I do not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer can complain of the way in which his Budget has been received. He has given us not very much information as to the financial effect of the various changes he has proposed, and, so far as I am concerned, with that official shortage of information, I am quite unable to follow his calculations or the basis on which he has framed them. I make this passing observation, that if the right hon. Gentleman is right as to the cost of the income-tax, then what he has appeared to give with one hand, he has largely withdrawn with the other; and I am surprised that more attention has not been paid to that point.

MR. STUART (Sunderland) said he had voted for the Finance Bill with some reluctance, because he thought the present Budget had not recognised that the burdens of the poor were too heavy in proportion to the burdens upon the rich. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had done well in increasing the death duties at the top and introducing some differentiation into the income-tax, although he regretted that he had not done so at the top rather than at the bottom. But on the whole the proportion of taxes upon the rich and poor had remained practically unchanged. He regretted that because the present House of Commons had been largely returned in order to see that the proportion of taxes on the poor was relatively lessened. He had supported the Government for two reasons. First, they must in giving a vote consider what would be the consequences if it helped to turn out a Government from which they expected so much and put in its place a Government whose policy they condemned. Secondly, he understood from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this Budget was not to be considered by itself, but that it must be taken in conjunction with future Budgets, which together would embrace the policy he desired. There were many in that House who agreed with him that before the present Government left office it was bound for the sake of the nation, for the well-being and prosperity of the people, to shift more burdens proportionately from the poor to the rich. The man upon whom their eyes should be fixed for the time was the man with 20s. a week and not the man with £2,000 a year, and it would be better for all in the House the sooner they recognised in legislative action that the very rich owed a very large debt to the very poor.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had done justice to himself, his Bill, and his Government, and he seemed to think that they had done a great deal for the working classes, although it appeared to him that they had done very little. The Government took a penny off the tea duty last year, but this year they said they could not take another penny off because it would not benefit the consumer. As to the tax on coal, the removal of the duty had made coal very much dearer and most things were dearer than when this wonderful Government came into office. In his opinion we taxed the wrong things. We allowed the luxuries of the rich to come in without any taxation, and how that could benefit the working classes he was unable to understand. In another way we injured our working people because we compelled our manufacturers to pay heavy rates and taxes which amounted to 12 per cent. on manufactured goods, and we allowed manufactured goods from foreign countries to come in without paying a single penny in the way of taxation. In fact we gave to foreigners a preference of 12 per cent. in our own market. We gave State aid to foreign manufactured goods to the extent of £12 in every £100; he did not think that could be disputed. To make up for that we had to put a heavy duty on tea and sugar, and things of that kind, and the poorer people had to pay for it. More than half the burden of the Budget was put upon the simple luxuries and necessities of the poor. Out of the vast sum which the Budget dealt with it was calculated that the working people paid more than £40,000,000 a year, and they paid over £20,000,000 a year in the way of import taxes. We allowed foreign nations to tax our manufactured goods to any extent they liked, and the result was, as far as he could see, that we made the poor pay more for their simple luxuries and necessities than did the poor in any other country in the world. This Budget taxed the tea and tobacco of the poor more than it taxed the tea and tobacco of the rich. That, he supposed, was another elaborate plan for benefiting the poor of the country. The system which the right hon. Gentleman called free trade, and which Liberals called a system of free food, resulted in millions of pounds being paid on the food of the poor. Yet the Party opposite claimed to be the friend of the poor and to reduce their taxation, and it was because of "terminological inexactitudes" of that sort that they managed to get such a large majority at the last general election. They were still playing the same old game in North West Ham. He went down there the other day and saw the same old bills and the same old posters all over the place, talking about free food. Was it any wonder that the people were coming to know how unfounded was the theory that Great Britain was a free trade country? The taxation in Germany was very much less than it was in this country, and it was put on things which were not the necessities and luxuries of the poor. In this country, however, the main portion of the taxes was put upon those luxuries and necessities. Surely that was against all the principles of the Liberal Party. It seemed to him that if we put a tax on manufactured goods other countries would have to pay us in raw material, which was exactly what we wanted. We were becoming more and more the consumers of raw materials and slightly manufactured goods than we were fifty or sixty years ago. In Germany a tax was put upon the importation of manufactured goods, and that was why they had money for wages which our poor people could not get. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had been obliged to tell the chambers of commerce that English trade carried on its operations under great and increasing difficulties, and that the burdens were day by day getting heavier and heavier. On another occasion he said that it was a matter of life and death to us to persuade other nations to rally to the free trade plan and come round to the "open door." We certainly had not persuaded them; we were being still further kept out of foreign markets, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would agree with him that we were dying now rather faster than we were before. People abroad were prevented from buying our goods and the foreigners were beating us in our own market, and this in spite of our being the greatest Empire in the world, and in spite of the fact that our people were in want and misery and hunger because they could not get into the foreign markets. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, in an article in the *Industrial Review* of 1901, said that the only reason he had for adhering to free trade was that he hoped by it to get rid of the landlords, and Socialists supported this ridiculous system now because they thought that the condition of the country would get so frightfully bad under it that they could engineer some social revolution and then carry their reforms afterwards. Under the present system we had no security of being able to retain any market except that of India for any length of time. We should retain the Indian market because we compelled India to adopt a system of taxation which was good for us. The Secretary of State for India would remember how in 1894 when a Liberal Government gave India a general tariff the Lancashire men came down and insisted upon an equal duty being put on Indian cotton, because otherwise the Lancashire people would have to pay the tax. Yet they were told that the consumer always paid the tax. It was the greatest humbug in the world. The only real employers of British labour were the people who bought British goods. After all was said and done, the manufacturers, dealers, and middlemen were only agents; they could not sell the goods if nobody would buy them. Under the present system of government foreign nations prevented their people from buying our goods, and that was simply because we had not the power to say, "If you play this game upon us we will do the same with you." The system did not benefit our poor people, it benefited only the middlemen and general dealers because they bought in the cheapest markets either the damaged goods of foreign white labour or the cheap product of African, Asiatic, and Indian labour. The poor of this country could only sell their labour in this country, while the dealers went to cheaper markets, and having sold their goods invested their money in foreign securities. That was the reason they did not want tariff reform. Hon. Members on the Ministerial Benches acknowledged they had no remedy for the present state of things. There were only two Parties in this country who had—the Socialists and the Tariff Reformers. So-called free trade was just about dead. It was on its last legs. The Budget showed that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite could not get any money, they had been knocking down expenses where they could, turning thousands of people out of employment at Woolwich and other places, and still they were in trouble, and next year their condition would be far worse. The trade unions had protected their members against the employers of this country, but they were powerless to protect them against the employers of other countries, and for that reason he was greatly surprised to find so many of them against the policy of his right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham. When the working classes of this country once became familiar with that policy they would no longer suffer the tribulation and the misery they now endured for the sake of allowing foreign manufacturers and workmen to grow fat upon their sufferings.

Mr. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) expressed regret that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not left the income-tax alone and directed his attention to providing for old-age pensions. It was said that the Colonies were willing to give us a preference, but the fact was that the Colonies would only give us a preference which would enable our manufactures to sell in their markets on equal terms with the Colonial products. It was idle to say that the Colonies were giving a preference when all the time, as anybody was aware who knew anything about the fiscal policy of the country, they were anxious to put on such a preference as would enable their own manufacturers to sell in their markets to the detriment of the British manufacturers. He asked the hon. Gentleman to answer the question whether the Colonies were prepared to give such a preference as would enable British manufacturers to compete in the Colonies on equal terms with Colonial manufacturers? If they did not do that, then preference was a mere idle dream.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 349.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith,Rt.Hon HerbertHenry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,JosephA.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,RedmondJ.(Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T (Cheshire
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burns, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cox, Harold
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar,Arthur(Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese,SirJosephF. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,SirW.D.(Colchester)
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor,TheodoreC.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)

Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie,H.T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Boland, John
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Clynes, J. R.
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Delany, William
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gretton, John
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea,HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murnaghan, George
Nolan, Joseph
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker,SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Shackleton, David James
Snowden, P.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Vincent,Col.SirC. E. Howard
Walsh, Stephen
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Seddon and Mr. George Roberts.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

King's Message [24th July], read.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) said: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise with perfect confidence to propose, (in response to the gracious Message from His Majesty) that a fitting recognition should be made of Lord Cromer's great services by a grant out of public funds. Hitherto, it is true, such grants have, with some exceptions, been confined to those who have performed conspicuous services to the country in war; but I do not imagine that in the House of Commons there will be many who would wish to exclude from tangible acknowledgment the quieter and less resounding, but not less glorious and hardly-won triumphs of peaceful administration. It would not be too much to say, that of all our peaceful administrators throughout the Empire of the present day Lord Cromer is the foremost man—foremost in courage, in wisdom, in resource, in patience; foremost, also, from the difficulties which he has had to encounter, foremost by the splendid results he has achieved. It is not, indeed, in Egypt only that he has done great services to this nation. Before his career in Egypt began he had done work in India, the effect of which is felt to this day. But it is to the last twenty-four years, which constitute the second half of his long public life, that our thoughts turn to-day. We all know how Lord Cromer's administration of the affairs of Egypt has been marked by striking material progress. That has been the case in every department of activity in the great province whose reconstruction he made the business of his life. Take the agricultural and other industries which he set himself to develop. The external trade of Egypt has doubled since he became Agent and Consul-General in 1883. The irrigation works carried out during his consulate have been the means of creating out of the desert fair and fertile tracts of vast extent. In the same period the population of Egypt has increased from 6,750,000 to 9,750,000. Egypt has suffered, and still suffers, from heavy taxation, but, notwithstanding the great outlay which all the improvements he effected in the public service entailed, Lord Cromer succeeded in reducing the burden of taxation per head by nearly 25 per cent., and the charge for interest on the debt was reduced by £890,000 a year. Beset as he was by demands for expenditure on every hand, he never lost sight of the paramount duty of economical administration, or forgot that the taxes were paid by the peasantry out of their poverty. That in itself is a splendid achievement. But the measure of Lord Cromer's success is not to be found or stated in any record of trade returns or financial statistics. The security and the liberty which his labours have secured for Egypt, the revival of justice, and the work he did for education—these are matters of which, I think, his countrymen are prouder than of the material results which he obtained. When we reflect upon the conditions under which this great labour was conducted and these results accomplished, when we remember that twenty-four years ago, when he began his task, Egypt was derelict and bankrupt, her people almost effaced under a burden of taxation and indebtedness, and that all his efforts for reform had to be carried out under a system surely the most cumbersome and grievous to be borne that ever hampered an administrator, it is difficult to find words in which to express the admiration we feel for the steadfastness and courage which enabled him to attain the ends which he set before himself. In his last Report Lord Cromer speaks of "the benefits which, with a rapidity probably unparalleled in history, have been conferred on the country by the introduction of Western civilisation at the hands of an alien race;" and I think he attributed to this state of things the growth of the national spirit in Egypt. But I wish to point out that Lord Cromer belongs to the school of administrators who hold it wise to hasten slowly in superimposing the civilisation of one race upon another; and we must bear this in mind if we are to appreciate the methods he has employed and the spirit he brought to his work. Lord Cromer profoundly disbelieved in any attempt to force the Egyptian people into a Western mould. He sought to preserve what was vital and characteristic in their habits, laws, and customs, and, so far from approaching them as an alien and a superior, he made it his business to understand their character and to study their grievances and their needs as they presented themselves to the actual people. And so by working through mediums familiar to them, and employing, as far as possible, native agents, he hoped to enable them to develop along their own lines, and to meet the civilisation of the West, not as hybrids, but as self-respecting beings in full possession of their own qualities and characteristics. When I see, as I sometimes see, Lord Cromer criticised for his want of sympathy with the national spirit, I am disposed to ask whether his wise and patient and understanding administration, and the respect shown by him from the first to the Egyptian race, do not entitle him to be considered as a great nationalist administrator. If he had cared to dazzle the world with swift and sensational results, there were plenty of capitalists ready to develop Egypt on the lines of European finance, and Lord Cromer would have saved himself infinite trouble if he had yielded to pressure and let them in. But he saw that the regeneration of Egypt could only be effected through the Egyptians themselves, and in devising measures for emancipating the peasantry from the bondage of debt, and preserving them in their own holdings, he laid the foundation of an agrarian policy which is equally the foundation of modern Egypt; and that policy, as I think, is not the least of his titles to the gratitude of the country he has served so well and to the admiration and respect of his countrymen. To a Ministry which has just lost Lord Cromer's services there are other considerations which come home with peculiar and poignant force. Indeed, I feel that I am speaking for succession of Ministries, which during the last twenty-five years have been preoccupied with the Egyptian question, when I say that in losing him we lose a public servant who in all the anxious and harassing events and complications associated with Egypt has been a tower of strength, whose courage, resource, wisdom, and loyalty never failed. The qualities which enabled Lord Cromer to surmount difficulties which seemed insoluble, and to maintain his serene outlook, and his firm grasp of affairs at times when other men would have been tempted to despair, were never obtruded on the public gaze, though, for all that, I think his countrymen have deduced from what they know of his personality and his labours a fair estimate of his services. Now that he has come home broken in health, having spent his strength and his fortune in the public service, I believe that, in showing him this mark of esteem, such as it is in the power of the House of Commons alone to accord, we shall be not only honouring, so far as it is in our power to honour, a great man who has greatly served his country, but enabling the country and the Empire through this House to recognise as they desire, the debt they owe to Lord Cromer.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,000, be granted to His Majesty, to be issued to the Earl of Cromer, O.M., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., in recognition of his eminent services as Agent and Consul General in Egypt."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): The rather unfortunate circumstances under which this Vote comes on for discussion compel me to confine my remarks into the space of a very few minutes. But those few minutes are enough to give me the opportunity of saying clearly and explicitly that my friends and I are anxious to give the Government our whole-hearted support in the course they are now pursuing. We believe that that course is the right course; we believe it is consistent with the honour of this country, and with the traditions of this House, and we are glad the Government have determined on a policy of which the vote to be taken to-night is the expression. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to the fact that this House has not been ungenerous in its recognition of the great services which distinguished generals in moments of national crises and difficulty have rendered the country.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: With other people's money.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Such interjections are regrettable, and I hope the hon. Member will restrain his feelings. But this, so far as I know, is the first time the House of Commons has been asked to vote to a civil servant any great mark of national gratitude, and while nobody doubts, or can doubt, that the labours of peace are as deserving of reward as the labours of war, still, undoubtedly, it is the fact that we do not recognise as part of our ordinary system the giving of special rewards to civil servants, however able and distinguished their services may be. The right hon. Gentleman did not expressly state, but he implied, the grounds upon which we may well differentiate the case of Lord Cromer from the cases of other civil servants, however able and distinguished, because we have before us in Egypt the fruits of the work of one great man, which stands out as isolated, as remarkable, as special, and as signal a work of genius as the more sudden glories of some great military triumph. It is separated, not perhaps as clearly and distinctly as a great military triumph, but it is separated from the work of those great civil servants abroad who have done inestimable service to the Empire, by special characteristics which mark it off and render it a matter for differentiation, and amply justifies the course which the Government have taken. The right hon. Gentleman has told us in outline, and it could only be done in outline, all that Lord Cromer has accomplished for Egypt. Lord Cromer's services during the past quarter of a century have raised

Egypt from the lowest pitch of social and economic degradation until it now stands among Oriental nations, I believe, absolutely alone in its prosperity, financial and moral. There is no triumph of civilisation to which Lord Cromer has not contributed in the course of those twenty-five years, material, moral, and intellectual. Everything he has touched he has succeeded in, every cause he has taken in hand he has furthered, and he left Egypt able to look back upon an administration longer, more beneficent, more fruitful, the results of which are more obviously apparent to all who have eyes to see and ears to hear, than perhaps can be boasted of by any one of his great predecessors who have, whether in the case of this country or in the case of any other country, carried on a great civilising work among nations which for one reason or another cannot perhaps rise to the level of those whose lot it is to govern. The difficulty of governing nations under these conditions is great. It requires sympathy, courage, steadfastness. Lord Cromer has all these qualities. He has dealt with the difficulties inevitable in such a situation. He has dealt with other difficulties as well, difficulties arising out of the peculiar international position in which Egypt finds herself, difficulties arising out of inevitable jealousies, of the presence in Egypt of large numbers of highly qualified and highly civilised Europeans who did not look upon our position in Egypt with a wholly friendly eye. These difficulties, diplomatic and social, he has dealt with successfully. He has dealt with them in a manner which has earned the permanent gratitude of the Egyptian people and which has well deserved some distinguishing mark of the gratitude which this House and country owe to one of its greatest public servants.

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and leave having been given to move the Adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 10, Further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

ADJOURNMENT (UNDER STANDING ORDER No. (O.) RADIOTELEGRAPHIC CONVENTION).

SIR EDWARD SASSOON rose to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the Report of the Select Committee on the Radio-Telegraphic Convention, and the declared intention of His Majesty's Government to proceed to ratification without affording the House an opportunity of discussing the subject. He desired to say in justice to those with whom he had the honour to act that no thoughts of possible Party advantage actuated them. The best proof of what he was advancing lay in the fact that it was by a Unionist vote that the brand of the Chairman's Report was plucked from the burning. It was with unaffected regret that he encroached upon the limited time of the House. He begged respectfully to assure the Prime Minister that it was with the utmost reluctance he had been brought to take this step. After the handsome manner in which the right hon. Gentleman met him last autumn, the action he now took might appear churlish and ungrateful, but the evidence before the Select Committee revealed lines of cleavage, points of doubt and anxiety as to the prospective outcome of ratification, such as many ingenuous laymen did not suspect. He ventured to think that His Majesty's Government would have been better advised if, in view of the strength of the minority, the extraordinarily conflicting nature of the evidence, the fact that the Post Office Vote, the only avenue to debate, was closed, that the Committee of Defence had not, as far as they were able to gather, deliberated upon the Convention in their collective capacity, they had seen their way spontaneously to offer the opportunity which he was now compelled to resort to under the forms of the House. He hoped he had disposed of any reproach of political ingratitude. He now came to the business in hand. The Convention was bound to affect, as any cursory student could see for himself, for weal or for woe, the defensive interests and commercial needs of this country. Let the House read the evidence of the eighteen witnesses who were examined and say if it was not such as to make it extremely doubtful whether the leap in the dark did not constitute a risk for which any counterbalancing advantage, if advantage did result, was likely to offer sufficient compensation. Experts circumvented and contradicted experts beyond anything known in the unravelling even of scientific problems; no sort of common view appeared to animate them, while the divisions of opinion were sharp and irreconcilable. The question that the Committee had before them was whether adhesion at the present moment was or was not expedient. That was the plain issue, and it was on the merits of that issue entirely unencumbered by collateral or subsidiary considerations as to the susceptibility of this or that Power that they had to decide. Of the bearings of our foreign relations they had necessarily no cognisance. These lay within the purview of the authority and responsibility of the Government. If they were committed morally or actually then the reference to the Committee was superfluous. The official view appeared to have been that enforcement of general intercommunication was desirable, less for any tangible good it might do or any injury it might avert, but rather to develop unfledged and embryonic systems. Let them test the soundness of their contention by looking to the experience of the past. The Marconi system, which was the best and most efficient organisation in the world, was developed on lines of non-intercommunication, and now they only asked to be allowed to develop their business in their own way. We were first in the field, and the geographical position of our coast stations gave us an undoubted advantage. Captain Bethell, the chief Admiralty delegate, said that he was opposed to compulsory intercommunication, but he had hit on the idea of relieving certain stations from liability to intercommunicate. But if intercommunication carried with it no risk of disturbance, why exempt any stations? To seek to justify a Convention the first principle of which was compulsory intercommunication, and then in the same breath say that everything was being done to neutralise that principle, showed a confusion of mind. Our delegates had tried to show that our organisation would not suffer in the business of foreign ships; but, when pressed, they had to admit that all foreign ships would take away their Marconi instruments. It was perfectly clear that the wireless organisation as constituted at present, an organisation which the Admiralty admitted to the Committee would give a great advantage to this country in an emergency, would be placed in this dilemma—either it would be ruined by accepting intercommunication, or it would be exposed to the loss of foreign business if the principle of exemption were admitted. The second ground on which the British delegates supported the Convention was that at present it was difficult for ships in British waters to communicate with the British coast. That was irrelevant. Every company and individual of any nationality was at perfect liberty to ask for a licence from the Post Office, and they had only to show that their system was workable on business lines. With regard to ships on the Atlantic seaboard, the delegates declared that, owing to the unwillingness of the Marconi stations to intercommunicate, many ships were unable to send messages. There were no less than thirty-one stations on the Canadian and Newfoundland coasts, and on the American coast there was no prohibition against any one setting up wireless installations. It was only necessary for ships to instal two systems—no very high price to pay to prevent the disturbance of our system here. It appeared, then, that the arguments urged by our official delegates at Berlin were based upon mere phantoms and chimeras. Another point was that if we adhered to this Convention, and it was desired that modifications should be made, Great Britain would have no more voice in the matter than Persia or Uruguay, countries which had no sort of connection with wireless telegraphy. That was a state of things which he felt sure the House would consider was perfectly intolerable. They were told that there ought to be free trade in wireless telegraphy, but he had yet to learn that compulsion in its most drastic form—such as obligatory intercommunication, standard wavelength, and all the rest of it—was consistent with any sort of freedom. He was sorry that the hon. Member for Preston was not present to direct his vigilant battery to this gross violation of all they had been accustomed to associate with the unhampered liberty of the individual. If our fiscal religion made it anathema to defend native industries, in the name of common sense let us not injure them by going out of our way to defend and benefit the industries of the foreigner. If a reliable service on commercial lines existed it would be to the interests of the Marconi Company to accept freely intercommunication so that with the activity which would result more grist would be brought to their mill. But those services and systems to which the Convention looked to see spring up like mushrooms in the night were, judging from the fruitless efforts in the recent past, but vague and nebulous potentialities, on which no sound business concern would be justified in basing its future calculations. It would be time enough to say things were comparable with cables and telephones when wireless services with an acknowledged financial position, with uniform rules of working, with means of calculating charges and settling accounts, were set up. We should wait for the emergence of such conditions and not put the cart before the horse. That serious disturbances might ensue from the provisions of the Convention was never more graphically illustrated than by the very talented delegate, Mr. Babington Smith, as well as the Admiralty delegate, Captain Bethell. Mr. Babington Smith said—

> "Moreover, we must remember that general intercommunication has yet to be carried out in practice. When the impatience of captains, the rivalries of telegraphists, above all when competition between different systems, and the possible want of accord between apparatus are taken into account, can we be sure that all will go well? The risk of miscarriage is the greatest where the traffic is the most concentrated; and it is precisely at such points that there is the greatest necessity to maintain communication without impediment and without delay. In the case of Great Britain a well-organised service already exists. We wish to preserve the right to retain this service, if necessary, with its present organisation, while placing other stations at the disposal of all the world. In order to show the drawbacks of a General Exchange, let us take an analogy which will appeal, perhaps, to those familiar with ordinary telegraphy. Let us suppose that a region of 20,000 square kilometres is provided with thousands of telegraph wires radiating from a common centre, and that everyone passing, whoever he may be, can transmit telegraphic signals to the centre by attaching any transmitter whatever at any point to any of these wires. It seems to me that the operator at the centre would certainly have a good deal of trouble as regards the efficient working of the system."

He knew that an attempt had since been made to explain away these arguments on the ground that they were mainly advanced in order to bring the other nations into line with us; but, none the less, anyone who read impartially Mr. Babington Smith's arguments could not but recognise that there was a very substantial basis of fact in them. We were told that if things went wrong all we had to do was to retire from the Convention by giving twelve months notice, but he would ask any hon. Gentleman opposite whether we could possibly expect to hark back, to revert to the old state of things, when such a delicately poised mechanism as the wireless installation was involved. He confessed the prospect filled him with dismay. Much as he hoped to be able to see eye to eye with the Postmaster-General at the earlier stage of the proceedings, subsequent reflection and a study of the evidence had convinced him that it would be premature and rash to bind our hands in any way. If non-adhesion was going to prove the evil the chairman so confidently predicted, he firmly believed that that evil would be far less so long as we retained unfettered liberty for the British organisation to evolve on the lines they had hitherto so successfully adopted in free and open competition. Why should the Admiralty allow other stations to be made the subject of experiment if they were going to exempt every Admiralty station? It was passing strange that a country occupying such a great maritime position as ours should have been susceptible to the instigation of a foreign Power in this matter. What advantages were we likely to gain by bartering a national asset for a mess of pottage? We, who owned more wireless stations than the rest of the nations of the world put together, need not have dreaded the development of the system. He thought it was a thousand pities that the Colonies should not have been asked for some agreement as to a basis of common action at the Colonial Conference, especially in view of the fact that Canada, at any rate, was becoming the point of contact between the East and West. In his judgment the compulsory standardisation, so far from conducing, as had been put forward by one delegate, to scientific development was likely to retard it. Who was likely to set his mind to the problem of inventing a new instrument if he knew that he had got to apply to a foreign Power before his instrument could come into general use? That was not the sort of incentive to make people work for the improvement of wireless telegraphy. There was another count in the indictment against the Marconi system, and that was that they refused to transmit signals of distress. That was perfectly untrue. Anyone who read the instructions which had been very carefully drawn up and issued to every operator, would see that they ought to receive signals of distress if they believed that they were really signals of distress. Then he should like to call attention to the question of the multiplication of dangers which would be caused by the multiplication of wireless telegraphy stations in foreign waters. He vainly endeavoured to persuade the Postmaster-General upstairs to take his view of this danger, and it was not going to be diminished but intensified by the ratification of the Radio-telegraphic Convention. There was another point upon which he wished to lay very great stress, namely, that so far as he had been able to gather, the members of the Committee of Defence had not had their minds collectively drawn to the bearing of this Convention.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (MR. HALDANE, Haddington) was understood to say that the subject had been considered by the Committee of Defence.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON said that in the Committee upstairs they could never get an answer to the inquiry whether the question had been deliberated upon by the Committee of Defence as a body, but, of course, he accepted at once the statement of the Secretary of State for War. He regretted the absence of the Postmaster-General and of the hon. Member for Falmouth who had drawn up the well-reasoned Report on this subject which at one time struggled for mastery. He would, however, say nothing in regard to that, as if he did he would have a hornet's nest about his ears. Nor did he wish to lay stress on the fact that the wireless telegraphy business of England was transferred to a foreign country as he understood it had been done. He thought anybody who had read the Report impartially must say that there seemed to be a great deal of doubt, hesitation, and misgiving. There was no question of trying to set up a monopoly, and if the Postmaster-General were there he thought he would bear him out in that statement. It seemed to him to be a case of misguided pressure. He hoped that the Government, as the master of many legions, would allow their supporters to vote as they thought fit. If that were done, he trusted they would be able to emancipate the Legislature from the thraldom of officialism. He begged to move.

*MR. GWYNN (Galway), in seconding the Motion, said that the Irish people were exceedingly proud of the fact that Mr. Marconi was half-Irish, and they were grateful because the operations of his company were doing something for Connemara. The West of Ireland should play an important part as a jumping-off station for wireless telegraphy, but the Irish people saw their part in the industry endangered by the precipitate action of the Government. Having regularly attended the sittings of the Committee upstairs and carefully considered the bearing of the Convention, he was strongly opposed to the ratification of the Convention. The matter must be seriously considered by the Government. They had despaired of the Civil Lord of the Admiralty, but they hoped to convince the Secretary of State for War. He believed the one purpose of the Convention was to break up the Marconi Company and to destroy the regulations with which the company had surrounded their organisation. Of course, other objects had been officially suggested. For instance, it was suggested that the Convention would give freedom in this matter to the Navy. But to any one who had studied the subject it was evident that our Government could secure precisely the same freedom for the Navy as was secured by the Convention. Under it the use of wave lengths between 600 and 1,500 metres was restricted to the Navy. There was no reason in the world why the Post Office, when it issued a licence, should not issue it on the condition that the user of the licence should not employ a wave length between 600 and 1,500 metres. That object could be gained without the Convention. So far as concerned the action of foreign ships, they had been told in Committee that, whatever they said in the matter, the Convention would be ratified, and, therefore, he took it for granted that it would bind all other countries except Great Britain. Great Britain could make precisely the same regulations for its own ships, and in that case he did not see why it was necessary to enter the Convention in order to secure the reservation of particular wave lengths for use in the Navy. There seemed to him to be no answer to that. They were told, again, that the object of the Convention was to avoid the confusion existing at the present time. It was impossible to limit the direction of wireless messages; an instrument could simply send out a message that would go all round the compass, and it stood to reason that the messages would tend to interfere with one another. The Convention proposed to avoid that interference by a series of artificial regulations saying that a ship should take a certain order of precedence, and that no two ships should signal the same station at the same time. He maintained that the only true way of avoiding interference was to leave every station absolute freedom as to the wave length used; that was to say, within reasonable limits—say from 600 metres downwards—which would give an ample margin of variation. But the Convention insisted that absolutely no ship and no shore station should use any wave length except one of 300 metres or 600 metres; so that if they had three stations signalling simultaneously within the same radius—and the radius of these dischages was admittedly very wide—it stood to reason that of these ships there must be two on 300 metres or two on 600 metres, and these two stations would be interfering with one another. It had been asserted to them by scientific persons that with developed instruments it was absolutely possible to "tune" out interference; that was to say, that if a neighbouring station was communicating with a wave length of 300 metres, to avoid disturbance and go on with their business they could "tune" out the interference. That was the natural resource for ships and shore stations to avoid interference, but it would be absolutely prohibited by the Convention, which would only allow of 300 metres and 600 metres. This substituted mechanical inefficiency and inconvenient regulations for the natural resources of the art. The question of confusion was in his opinion not avoided, but was stereotyped by the Convention's regulations; it was precisely these natural resources at their disposal which would be forbidden to them if they signed this Convention. He came now to the other argument. It was supposed by this Convention that they were going to give a fair chance to the other British companies. He thought it was perfectly fair and right that the other companies, whether British or not, should have a fair chance, and nobody proposed to stop them. The Marconi Company expressly said: "If you will only leave us alone, if you will not sign this Convention which forces us practically to intercommunicate, then you may issue licences so far as we are concerned to other stations or other companies which will be willing to intercommunicate, but the present position of the Marconi Company is that they have got the organisation and are able to use a particular instrument and keep control of the whole matter. We refuse absolutely to receive at our stations a message from any station which does not belong to our organisation." The effect of this Convention was to compel them to receive any message by whomsoever sent. The Marconi Company was perfectly willing that the Government should give licences to the rival companies which might be willing to intercommunicate, and which, because they were willing to intercommunicate, would naturally gain a certain amount of business. These rival companies, if rival companies there were, which he very much doubted, would get whatever business there was going. The Marconi Company said, "Very well, so long as you leave us alone, and do not force upon us regulations which are hostile to our system, we are content." In that sense they stood up in defence of what was called their monopoly. He would like to lodge a protest against the use of the word "monopoly." A monopoly was an exclusive right to sell some particular thing, which was conferred by law; but the Marconi Company were only monopolists in this sense, that they were the only people who sold a particular article. If they wanted to send a wireless message by way of the Atlantic to Canada they must rely on the Marconi Company; there was nobody else to buy it from. In that sense they were monopolists if they liked. But why were they monopolists? He asked the House to consider for a moment the history of this company. He did not want to go into the scientific question nor into who first made the discovery of wireless telegraphy; he did not want to go into the question of invention or of who it was that first gave practical application to the principle, nor into the question of priority of commercial application, which was now a most important question in connection with the matter. When the matter was under discussion ten years ago, Mr. Marconi came to this country for the first time with his invention. He believed that if the Post Office had done its duty in times past they would have had none of this trouble now. Whether the Post Office made offers to Mr. Marconi he did not know, but at any rate they did not secure the patent rights. A company was formed and they set to work upon an enormously costly business, namely, the creation of a great commercial organisation with a capital of £750,000. A very large proportion of that £750,000 had been spent in creating the organisation, and up to 1903 the company had no privilege except the free use of the air. It was quite true that the Government could have said to the Marconi Company that the Post Office alone had a right to all telegraphs, that they would not use wireless telegraph themselves, and that they would give nobody else the right. The Department had not done that. The Marconi Company had established their organisation, and they were beholden to the Post Office for having been permitted to be the pioneers in this matter. From 1903 onwards the Post Office had not granted any licences for wireless telegraphy. The Marconi Company had created the great organisation which was called a monopoly. It covered a very great part of the world, and was in existence before 1903. The years which had elapsed since had consolidated that monopoly, because they were the only people who had been carrying on this particular business on a large scale. But he submitted that this monopoly was a most creditable thing, because it was a monopoly which rested not on privilege but upon efficiency. A monopoly which rested on efficiency was no more a monopoly than an artist's monopoly in his own talent. They were the only people in the field at the present time. But now there were other people who wanted to compete. Let them compete. Why could not the Government licence a station on the South Coast or anywhere they liked. There was ample expert evidence before the Committee that these stations need not interfere with the business of neighbouring stations so long as they left them free to use the natural resources at their command. If they were only to transact business with one wave length it was probable that they could not put up a station there at all; but if they were left free to use their own wave length then they could stud the coast with short distance stations. In that sense there was a good chance for rival British companies, and in that way they might make a move which would afford them the only possible chance of ultimate development. He had not the least doubt that when the thing developed they would have intercommunication, but he thought that would be arrived at through the mutual interests of competing organisations. At the present moment there was only one organisation carrying on the business of wireless telegraphy in a commercial sense. The others were merely manufacturers of telegraphic apparatus. What this Convention proposed to do was to allow a man who bought telegraphic apparatus to fix his apparatus and send telegrams to any of the Marconi stations. The Marconi Company said that was unfair; that one of the most important things in this matter was the discipline of the service, that it should be under the control of one company, and that that discipline of service would be sacrificed and destroyed if control was given to several companies. This was a matter upon which he felt very strongly. The Marconi Company were first in the field, and they created their position with no thanks to the Government and no resources that were not equally open to everyone else. Before 1903 they had no privilege or advantage over any competitors, except that of superior enterprise, and they maintained with justice that, if the Convention were ratified now, the use of the organisation which they had created would be given to their rivals. There was evidence given before the Committee which showed that the most efficient and developed apparatus was developed away from the least common measure. That was to say that all the first instruments used in wireless telegraphy were inter-communicative, but it was admitted that one highly-developed instrument would not inter-communicate. That particular apparatus was far more perfect than any other, and if that was put into operation it would not receive signals from any other apparatus. It was highly probable that if inter-communication was enforced on all instruments the effect would be to stereotype an inferior instrument. One witness told them that all that could be got over in a short time, but others told them "nothing of the sort." His strongest objection to this Convention was the stereotyping of "wave lengths," the meaning of which was that if there were three ships all signalling within close proximity of each other and all signalling in the same wave length, that the three sets of signals would become confused when received at the station. If those ships were allowed to choose their own wave lengths it would be like having three separate wires instead of one. The Convention said that there should only be one, which showed that they were legislating for something which they had not studied and did not understand. To his mind the strongest objection to the Convention was the stereotyping of the wave lengths. He earnestly appealed to the Secretary of State for War to consider what we were doing before we went into this matter, and before we broke up rights which had been established, not as a matter of privilege, but by simple ability, commercial efficiency, and an extraordinary development of intellience by Mr. Marconi and the company to which he belonged.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn." (*Sir Edward Sassoon.*)

MR. HALDANE said he shared the regret which the hon. Baronet opposite had expressed at the absence of the Postmaster-General, who had made a special study of this subject. It fell to him to send a representative to the Berlin Conference on behalf of the War Office, and, therefore, he had to familiarise himself to some extent with the topic of controversy. That was his excuse for rising to address the House on the policy of the Government in the matter. There was another ground of regret which he had at this Motion coming on at this time, and that was that, unfortunately for the House, the evidence which was taken before the Select Committee had not yet been printed. Notwithstanding these difficulties, he thought the point was a somewhat simple one. The hon. Member for Galway in his interesting speech spoke of this as championing the cause of an Irishman. He would have had more sympathy with that sentiment if it was really Mr. Marconi's cause he was championing. But Mr. Marconi, like other inventors, sold his rights to a powerful company, and it was with a company that controversy was at the present time maintained. That being so he thought questions of sentiment were a little out of place.

*MR. GWYNN thought the right hon. Gentleman was not quite fairly representing the facts. Mr. Marconi was very closely identified with the Marconi Company, and he thought all recognised the fact that the scientific development of Mr. Marconi's work was only possible through the field of experiment which the existence of the company gave.

MR. HALDANE said that that, no doubt, was perfectly true, but they were dealing, not with an inventor, but with a company, with whom they must deal on commercial lines, and he hoped to put before the House what were the legal rights and the commercial position of the company in relation to the Post Office. The real question before the House was whether the Government, following out the policy of the previous Government and carrying it to completion, had done right in entering into an international Convention, whereby each nation should put into its licences a clause compelling those who obtained those licences to accept messages from other systems. Surely it was more in the interests of humanity, to go no further, that there should be the utmost freedom of inter-communication than that there should be the restrictive system which existed at the present time. Supposing a ship were coming to this side of the Atlantic from the other, and a ship with a different set of instruments was passing, and anything happened, under the Marconi Company's system the shore stations would be prohibited from receiving their messages. It was not a question of bureaucratic pressure. What was the situation in regard to those who made use of wireless telegraphy ? Under the law in this, and he should think of every civilised country, the matter was regulated by the State. In this country it was so under the Act of 1904, and it was perfectly reasonable because the Marconi Company from their station could not carry on business unless they could bring their messages up to London, and the Post Office had very properly the power of controlling and of imposing conditions in the licences issued for telegraphic purposes. That being so, the Marconi Company had negotiations with the Post Office some time ago as to the terms of a licence. The position of the Post Office was this. In 1903, he thought it was, various subjects in connection with wireless telegraphy were discussed at a conference held in Berlin, and, among others, this particular subject was reserved for a future Convention. The Post Office took the course of making provision for the possibility of this Convention's being signed. They were then passing the Act of 1904, which gives them control over the licences; at the same time they were negotiating with the Marconi Company for the terms upon which they should carry on the business, and they eventually, in August, 1904, came to an agreement which contained a clause to which he invited the attention of the House, because it disposed once and for ever of the contention that the Marconi Company had a monopoly right which was now being unjustly taken away. The situation was that the Marconi Company were bargaining for what was essential to them, the consent of the Post Office and a licence, and the Post Office had in view the possibility of an international system, and the obligation of communication between different systems. Clause 10 of the agreement of 1904 stated that in the event of His Majesty's Government adhering for the United Kingdom to a Convention, the company undertook to observe in the United Kingdom and on British ships the provisions of Article 6 of the Convention and any detailed regulations thereunder, and among the regulations was one by which the company undertook to accept the obligation of interchange and communication without assistance or reservation, but without prejudice to their patent rights. But these patent rights were not affected; the broad ground of the agreement was that, notwithstanding the Marconi Company had made stipulations with other people, they bound themselves to give up their rights if the Post Office entered into such a Convention as was now entered into. That removed any contention that any hardship was imposed on the Marconi Company, and the Government were justified in making the agreement in the public advantage. But now the controversy was carried on upon another ground that deserved a few words. The Convention was confined to communication between shore stations and ships, not between ship and ship, or between land station and land station: that communication was untouched. The Admiralty was kept outside, for they did not wish their instruments to be hampered by the obligation to receive other messages; the purpose of the Convention was to make sure that any ship, whatever the system, should be able to communicate with the shore station she was approaching. Was it expedient that that provision should be adopted ? In favour of that they had the Admiralty, the Army, the Post Office, the Committee of Imperial Defence, and Lloyd's, all approving of it. They had all the men of science, with the exception of the distinguished gentleman who was the adviser of the Marconi Company and Mr. Marconi himself.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Has the decision of the Defence Committee been come to since the sittings of the Committee upstairs were completed?

MR. HALDANE said that as far as he knew the decision was previous to the sittings of the Committee.

MR. GWYNN said there was only one scientific witness before the Committee who was not attached somehow or other to some company.

MR. HALDANE said Sir Oliver Lodge was surely a witness of authority on such a matter. So far as he knew, the whole body of science was with the Government. It was the Marconi Company, like Athanasius, *contra mundum*.

MR. GWYNN said there was no witness on the abstract question of science. The evidence of the scientific witnesses, except in the one case of Charles Bright, was for some company interested.

MR. HALDANE said he would not put it higher than that there was a considerable body of science in favour of carrying out the Convention as proposed by the Government. Mr. Babington Smith, whose evidence had been referred to, pressed for the expediency of exempting the Admiralty stations in time of war. He was arguing in favour of the Convention. The Canadian standard form of licence was exactly that for which the Government were contending. The Colonial Premiers also took, so far as he knew, exactly the same view as the Imperial Government. To dispose of the matter very shortly, the Government thought it expedient in the interests not only of public convenience, not only of international amenities, but of business, and, for that matter of, humanity, that there should be the freest possible interchange of messages between ships and the stations they came near. They were not asking the House that other nations should control us in this matter. They proposed entering into a Convention which left the control in their own hands. Certain rules, they were all agreed, were workable. The Convention was one from which they could withdraw. All they were aiming at was to get other nations to agree on a system which they might all adopt. The Admiralty were satisfied that this plan would be useful in case of war. The War Office was satisfied that there were great advantages in the system from a military point of view. The Post Office were satisfied, and also the commercial world. And the contrary view was only held by those who claimed for themselves some sort of monopoly right. There was, however, no question of monopoly right here, for he maintained that the Marconi Company contracted themselves out of any monopoly right. The Government had thought this matter out carefully, and had entered into a Convention which they believed to be a good one, and, unless the House carried the Motion. they proposed to proceed forthwith to ratify it. It would be interesting to see whether the monopolists would test their strength against the case he had put before the House.

Question put, and negatived.

SUPPLY.

Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,000, be granted to His Majesty, to be issued to the Earl of Cromer, O.M., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., in recognition of his eminent services as Agent and Consul-General in Egypt," resumed.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said that, in accordance with the notice he had already given, he rose to object to the Vote. He did not think it was necessary to say that in the action he was taking he was not in the slightest degree actuated by any personal motive or feeling against Lord Cromer. Personally, he had no acquaintance with Lord Cromer, and he shared the feeling which was generally aroused by the statement of the Prime Minister that Lord Cromer had returned from Egypt in a shattered condition of health. His action was inspired entirely by the view he took of the matter from the point of view of the public. He submitted that Lord Cromer was not entitled to this unprecedented and enormous sum of money. The Prime Minister had frankly admitted that it was an unprecedented demand upon Parliament. He had told them that while it was true that great military leaders, such as Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener, had been granted large sums of money for services rendered over and above the pay to which they were ordinarily entitled, there was no precedent for granting a sum of money of this kind to a civil servant. He asked the right hon. Gentleman at Question time one day to refer him to the case of any civil servant in the position of Lord Cromer receiving a large Parliamentary grant, but the only precedent the right hon. Gentleman had given him was that of Sir Rowland Hill, who received a special grant of £25,000 in addition to a pension of the full amount of his salary. He noticed to-night with some interest that the Prime Minister did not refer to the precedent of the grant to Sir Rowland Hill; he entirely refrained from referring to any other so-called precedent. He himself maintained that there was really no precedent for the Vote which the Prime Minister now asked Parliament to give. The case of Sir Rowland Hill was not a precedent. Sir Rowland Hill was the author of a great and far-reaching reform, which carried with it immense benefit to all classes of the community. His services were entirely exceptional, and they had been of immense benefit to the Irish people. Therefore, there was in his case some reason why, having acted greatly to the advantage of the British taxpayer, he should be shown some special consideration. But he submitted that Lord Cromer had rendered no such advantageous services to the taxpayer, and, in his opinion, in these times when so many demands were made on Parliament for money for the benefit of large sections of the people who were in dire distress, to ask for this money for Lord Cromer, distinguished though his services might have been, was to do something entirely inconsistent with the spirit of Liberal principles and would be extremely disappointing to large masses of the supporters of the Government. He might be told that Lord Cromer had rendered great services to the Egyptian people. The Prime Minister in his very earnest speech recommending this Vote had reminded the House of the immense services Lord Cromer had rendered to the finances of Egypt; they were told that Lord Cromer found Egypt practically on the verge of bankruptcy. He believed it was perfectly true that Lord Cromer had rendered considerable services to the finances of Egypt, but if he was to be rewarded, surely the reward should come from Egyptian finance, and not from the taxpayers of this country who, after all, had not derived any financial advantage from the reforms effected by Lord Cromer in Egypt. If it was desirable that he should receive this money, then it should be paid to him from Egyptian sources. It was not fair or just that the taxpayers of this country should be asked to pay this enormous sum to Lord Cromer at the very time when, as they knew, they could not leave the House and walk the streets to their homes without seeing on every hand signs of the existence of a large class of deserving unemployed people. He asked the House to consider what Lord Cromer's position in Egypt had been for twenty-four years. During all that time he had been in receipt of a large and adequate salary. He knew that the salary had not at all times been the same, but it had been a considerable salary at all times. Recently it had been over £6,500 a year. Lord Cromer, moreover, was entitled to a pension at the present time of £900 a year. He held that no matter how much they might admire the services of Lord Cromer, they were not entitled to set up a new precedent by voting £50,000 of the people's money to a public servant who had received an adequate salary all the time he had been in Egypt. If Lord Cromer was entitled to this, what about other noblemen who in the opinion of some people had equally deserved the country's favour and bounty? He had never heard of anybody else receiving a grant of this kind. Why was it not proposed for Lord Milner, for instance? He had never heard the most ardent admirers of Lord Cromer speak of him in terms of higher praise and glorification than had been used of Lord Milner. An hon. Member objected; he would sit down to give him an opportunity of explaining to what he objected.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: My objection was to speeches which were made from the Treasury Bench concerning Lord Milner in debate last session.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: To what statements does the hon. Gentleman refer?

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Uncomplimentary statements.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he was anxious to deal with the matter in a spirit of fairness and without extravagance of language. If the hon. Gentleman challenged him, however, he could assure him that there were people in this country and in Egypt who were prepared to refer to Lord Cromer in terms quite as strong as those which had been used of Lord Milner. What had been particularly the services of Lord Cromer? Had they been in any way political? Was any Member of the Government prepared to get up now and give some information as to the instructions which Lord Cromer received when he was sent to Egypt? He was sent to Egypt, to do what? To carry out the policy of the Government of that day in Cairo. And what was that policy? Acting in co-operation with the Sultan of Turkey, Lord Cromer was to see that the power and authority of the Khedive were re-established with a view to enabling the British Army of occupation to evacuate Egypt. The present Duke of Devonshire, the Marquess of Hartington in those days, declared that the limit for the continued occupation of Egypt might be set at six months. Instead of that, the British Army of occupation had been twenty-four years in Egypt, and there was not the slightest talk or mention of evacuating that country. [Cheers.] Yes, and he asked the hon. Gentlemen who cheered, was Lord Cromer to receive £50,000 because, instead of carrying out the policy of evacuation which he was ordered to do, he had made Egypt into a British province, occupied by an Army which could not for a moment be withdrawn? If Lord Cromer was to be rewarded in this way because he had not carried out the policy of evacuation, but because he had made Egypt into a British province, that could only be characterised as false and fraudulent in the face of the civilised world. [Cries of "Oh, shame," and "Withdraw."] He was perfectly ready at any moment to withdraw any statement which he could not substantiate, but he reiterated that if it were true that Lord Cromer's instructions, when he was sent to Egypt twenty-four years ago, were to carry out the policy of restoring the authority and privileges of the Khedive with the view to evacuation; and if it were true that the present Duke of Devonshire desired to set a limit of six months to that evacuation being carried out; and if it were true that Lord Cromer had strengthened the hold of England on Egypt—then something was done which undoubtedly was fraudulent in the eyes of the civilised world. He noticed that the Prime Minister in his eulogy of Lord Cromer had spoken of the manifold benefits which he had conferred on the Egyptian people in every direction. He quite admitted that Lord Cromer had certainly regulated and put upon a sound basis the finances of the country. [AN HON. MEMBER on the OPPOSITION Benches: And everything else.] The hon. Gentleman above the gangway said, "Everything else." He challenged that statement in every way. Apart from public works and finance, Lord Cromer's work in Egypt had been singularly unsuccessful and unfortunate. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] Well, that was his opinion, and it seemed to him that there must be something in what he was saying, since it roused such strong opposition from hon. Gentlemen above the gangway. They would have plenty of opportunity later on of proving that he was wrong. They were told that Lord Cromer had so reorganised the Egyptian Army that it was in a very highly satisfactory condition at the present moment. He denied that. If he were asked on what he based his denial he replied that it was on the almost unanimous opinion of the Egyptian people themselves; and if there were any hon. Gentlemen in the House who with that spirit of insular superiority which was sometimes manifested imagined that the Egyptian people did not count, he contended that they were extremely mistaken. The Prime Minister had talked of imposing the ways and methods of civilisation on the Egyptian people. He maintained that educated Egyptian people were quite as civilised and as well entitled to form a sound view in regard to their country as Englishmen were in regard to their country. He insisted again that Lord Cromer's policy in regard to the Egyptian Army had been a total failure. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] With very few exceptions every command was held by Englishmen, and the greatest possible irritation and indignation was felt in Egypt in consequence. Last year, when there was some probability of a quarrel with Turkey, the British garrison in Egypt was reinforced because not the smallest attempt could be made to trust the Egyptian Army as reorganised by Lord Cromer. The position in Egypt was much the same as in Ireland, where every position of honour and emolument was in the hands of Englishmen, and the Egyptian people were made to feel that they were but hewers of wood and drawers of water in their own country. Let them take the Department of the Interior and Public Works. That Department was filled by Englishmen who were ignorant entirely of the circumstances of the case. Lord Cromer himself admitted that crime in Egypt had recently increased to an extraordinary extent, and the only explanation given was that that crime was the result of increased prosperity. Then as to the question of education, he asked any hon. Gentleman who took an interest in education what he thought of the position in Egypt. The almost unanimous opinion of the people of Egypt was that the educational policy had been that of checking education so as to keep the mass of the Egyptian people in such a state of ignorance that there should be no political advancement. That was a policy that could not succeed. The Department of Justice was almost entirely under English direction. There were one or two native Judges it was true, but with very few exceptions justice was administered by English persons who were entirely ignorant of the language of the people of the country. When he was told that Lord Cromer had placed the Department of Justice in Egypt on a satisfactory basis he denied it absolutely. If he were asked for an instance where justice had not gone straightforward in Egypt, he was compelled to refer to what took place at Denshawi last year. The Prime Minister in his strong and able appeal for Lord Cromer had spoken of him as a great man of peace and as a man who had exercised humane methods, and had said that if a reward was given to men for success in war, whose success had been the success of rapine and devastation, should not there also be a reward for a man of peace like Lord Cromer? But Lord Cromer had not always been a man of peace nor had he always acted humanely; and things had been done in Egypt under his administration and with his sanction at which civilisation stood shocked to-day. A more savage and ruthless miscarriage of justice never took place in the name of civilisation in any part of the world than that which took place at Denshawi, and it made the matter worse to know that that miscarriage of justice was still going on. In the prisons of Egypt at the present time men were suffering under absolutely unjust sentences. What took place at Denshawi? It was a gruesome story, well known to many Members of the House, but better known and hoarded in the hearts of the Egyptian people from one end of the country to the other. Five British officers went for a pigeon-shooting expedition to an Egyptian village. The Government knew perfectly well, as was admitted by the Foreign Secretary last year, that these pigeon-shooting expeditions were repugnant to the people of the villages. These five officers when they arrived were asked by the people to desist from shooting the pigeons and not to offend or outrage the well known sentiments of the people. They refused. A scuffle ensued, and one woman standing by was shot. Two men were also shot but were not killed, but the indignation of the people was none the less. The officers were mobbed. Supposing the conditions had been reversed, and instead of five officers going into an Egyptian village with arms in their hands, five foreigners entered an English village under like conditions, and a woman was shot while her husband was standing by and two men were shot, what then would have been the nature of the scuffle? The officers were mobbed. Two ran away, and one after running a great distance died of sunstroke. That was the evidence of the medical man.

As a justification for what afterwards took place they were told in the journals of this country that that officer was cruelly beaten to death. He absolutely denied it; the treatment that that officer received was not such as to cause death. He died of sunstroke after running so far in the great heat. What should have been the result in such a case? Ought not at any rate the practice of these shooting expeditions at once to have been denounced and the officers reprimanded for their conduct? What should have been the punishment, if any punishment was considered necessary so far as the people who had attacked these officers were concerned? He knew what punishment would have been meted out by public opinion in this country; but how did Lord Cromer deal with the case? How was it dealt with by this great humane gentleman, to whom they were asked to give a fortune while our streets were filled with men, aye, and women too, who had not the price of a bed? A special tribunal was summoned, consisting of Englishmen with one native Judge who was to be relied upon—a man of that class who could always be found in every subject land—and on the report of a secret inquiry which took place four days before the trial began it was decided that these villagers should be punished with death, on the sole testimony of the officers, without cross-examination, and that half an hour should be allowed for the defence of the fifty-seven prisoners. Four of these men were condemned to be hanged, eight to be scourged in public, nine to various terms of imprisonment with hard labour and to be lashed, and by an act of special brutality the husband of the woman who was shot was sentenced to penal servitude for life, when his only crime was that his hot blood rose when he saw his wife killed and he endeavoured to avenge her. If there was any Englishman who believed in what was right he would not give a farthing of this money at any rate before a statement had been made that this man should be set at liberty and an end put to a thing which was a shame and a disgrace to England. How was this savage sentence carried out? The four natives who were condemned to death for the murder of the man who died from sunstroke and for attacking other British officers were hanged, and six others who were convicted of complicity were flogged. The prisoners were conveyed in carts to Denshawi, guarded by a detachment of infantry. The gallows and the flogging-post followed. The cavalcade arrived at Denshawi early. A space of 60 yards wide was roped off close to where the attack had been made, and the gallows and the whipping-post placed in the centre. Then a man was hanged, and left hanging while two of the other men were flogged, and then another man was hanged and two more flogged, then the remaining two were hanged and the other culprits flogged. The men and women of the villages who were grouped at some distance off wailed dismally as their relatives and friends suffered and the condemned men met their death with calm. Was there a Member present who could say there was any measure of proportion between the crime committed and the sentence inflicted? There was no proportion whatever; and further, this single incident of Denshawi, if it stood alone, made it impossible for any man who loved fair play to vote for the grant under discussion. He appealed to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to say that he considered the punishment excessive, and to release the men who were still incarcerated. He did not grudge Lord Cromer the honours and titles he had received, but he did draw the line at asking for the money of Irish as well as English taxpayers to make a presentation to a gentleman whose name would for ever be connected with what was a blot and a disgrace on the name of the British Empire.

*MR. H. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): Rot.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask hon. Members not to interrupt with expressions of that kind.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: It is a truly worthy sentiment from an English gentleman, and it is not at all surprising when we look across the floor and see that the hon. Gentleman is a relative of a noble peer named Lord Clanricarde.

*MR. H. BEAUMONT: The expression which I used, and which I am quite ready to withdraw, did not refer to the state of affairs in Egypt, but to what the hon. Member said about Lord Cromer.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND said it was really a matter of indifference what the hon. Gentleman thought. What they were now discussing was a matter of serious importance to this country and for the people of Egypt as well, and the grimness of the tragedy could not be removed by any such interruption as that of the hon. Gentleman. Was Lord Cromer to be rewarded on the proposition of the Liberal Party because of his sacrifices in the cause of freedom, liberty, nationalism, Home Rule, self-government—call it what they would? Why, it was notorious that almost the last words of Lord Cromer, on leaving Egypt, were in bitter hostility to the national sentiment of the Egyptian people. He declared against Egyptian self-government, and that was one of the reasons why he was to be rewarded. At any rate it was a reason which an Irishman could not accede to. Apart from any other consideration, the hostility of Lord Cromer to the strong spirit of Egyptian nationality was a reason why there were men who would vote against the grant. Lord Cromer had done well for the finance of Egypt, and he had come home from that point of view personally above reproach. But be that as it might, he objected to the proposed Vote from the point of view that Lord Cromer was an opponent of national sentiment, and because he believed that it was an outrageous proposition to ask for large sums of money in this way when they knew, and the Chief Secretary knew perfectly well, that there was not a Department in Ireland which was not almost starved for want of money. Ireland, unless he was greatly mistaken, certainly could have no part in this transaction, and he opposed the grant just as he had opposed the grants to Lord Kitchener and Lord Roberts.

Mr. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.) said that he, as an inexperienced Member, with considerable diffidence, also ventured to oppose this Motion for a grant to Lord Cromer; but he remembered the humane traditions of the Nationalist Party, and how they had always taken the side of the oppressed and outraged. But, inexperienced as he was, he was not going to be diverted from his purpose by the clamour of hon. Gentlemen above the gangway, who were so accustomed to plundering the public funds, and some of whose pensioners, if he mistook not, at that moment sat on the Front Opposition Bench, who had such a tradition of plunder behind them. The £50,000 to be voted was to be taken from the miserable and destitute population of this country and of Ireland, and a proposition such as that would receive the support of hon. Members above the gangway as a matter of course. Really he did not remember to have seen the Opposition united before in support of the Government. When they heard statements of principle on matters of social reform made from the Liberal benches they were not accustomed to see such cordial support given by the Opposition as they now saw being given in regard to this grant. Anyone who professed to adhere to Radical principles must feel extreme moral discomfort upon going into the division lobby in support of the proposed Vote. What was the explanation? It was that the present Liberal Government had no foreign policy at all; they took over the foreign policy of their predecessors. The result was that, encouraged by their traditions and by the advice tendered in such organs as the *Daily Mail*, the Government had come forward with this proposal to-night. In India they had proclamations of coercion; in Egypt donations to retired despots. He had listened with interest to the Prime Minister's eloquent statement in which he mentioned everything that would probably have been taken for granted, but he did not say a word about Denshawi. When he heard the almost complete silence with which this proposal was greeted, he wondered whether the right hon. Gentleman was enjoying his task. What was the case against the grant? There was the general argument against such donations to retired civil servants. It had been in the past customary with savage communities to honour the victors in war, and the bloodier the war the bigger the honour. That custom still survived in some communities which laid claim to civilisation. In the past they had opposed such grants to Lord Kitchener and Lord Roberts, and they were going to oppose the grant to Lord Cromer. Why did the Government not organise the Civil Service upon a proper basis? Either they had been paying Lord Cromer a sufficient salary or they had not. What was the justification, as a matter of mere common sense and scientific argument, of this exceptional grant? He made no attack upon the personal character of Lord Cromer, although he felt bound to say that the personal vices of despots had always seemed to him to be the most attractive thing about them, because, in the practice of those vices at any rate, they used up a certain amount of energy that might otherwise have been spent in the oppression of their fellow beings. They made no personal attack upon Lord Cromer. It had been said that he was a poor man. That might be so and it might not be so. If it were true it was very creditable to Lord Cromer; but that was a very poor argument for taking £50,000 from people who were infinitely poorer. He did not deny that under Lord Cromer's association with Egyptian affairs there had been a considerable advance in the material prosperity of that counrty. If they examined Egyptian Budgets they would find that Lord Cromer had always been much more willing to provide money for material advancement than for the work of education. The explanation of that was that the more educated the people became the more restive they were likely to grow under such a state of affairs as existed in Egypt. The opposition to this Vote was in the nature of a protest against the whole spirit and temper of Lord Cromer's administration. They protested against the manner in which Lord Cromer had gone beyond the terms of his original appointment, and had broken—in obedience, he supposed, to orders from home—the definite undertakings given by the responsible Government of this country. They protested against the fashion in which he had treated the Egyptians as an inferior race. They protested against the way in which he had outraged Egyptian public opinion and refused to allow it to play any part in the shaping of Egyptian policy. The indiscretions of 1906, which brought this country to the verge of war with the entire Moslem world, established a sufficient case against Lord Cromer. When they placed beside that the infamy of Denshawi, how could anybody holding Liberal principles vote for a Motion of this character? His hon. friend the Member for East Clare had spoken in detail about the Denshawi incident. The importance of that question was not so much its savage details of which his hon. friend had given such a graphic description, but the fact that it demolished at one blow the entire Cromer myth. It showed that after twenty-five years of English administration they had once more been obliged to have recourse to the gibbet and the lash in order to terrorise the Egyptians into an acceptance of our rule. A retired Anglo-Indian bureaucrat was thought to be extremely suitable for Egypt. He remembered listening to the Foreign Secretary last year when this question was under discussion, and on that occasion the right hon. Baronet said that the machinery of Government in Egypt was so confused and complicated that nobody except Lord Cromer could keep it going. Since then the Government had appointed Sir Eldon Gorst as Lord Cromer's successor. He was amazed to hear Lord Cromer spoken of as a man who had resisted the temptations of European financiers in Egypt, because the entire history of that country for the last quarter of a century had been a constant struggle between Egyptian freedom and European finance. Lord Cromer went to Egypt as the chosen darling and protector of European finance. In the year 1881 the announcement was made that there was going to be a development of representative institutions in Egypt. Lord Cromer was in Egypt as a book-keeper, an official receiver for a sort of bankrupt concern. He went there for six months twenty-four years ago, and now the Government was sending somebody else to continue the temporary occupation. He agreed with his hon. friend that if Lord Cromer was to be rewarded, he should be rewarded out of Egyptian funds. Lord Cromer ought to be very popular on the Stock Exchange, if it were possible to associate feelings of gratitude with that assembly. He had stated what was the legal and proper position of Lord Cromer in Egypt, but during the whole tenure of his office his labours had been devoted to pressing his influence in entirely illegitimate spheres. He had got a dominant influence over the administration of Egypt. He had devoted his energies to an attempt to Anglicise the administration of Egypt, and especially education. He had devoted himself to undermining the influence of the native responsible rulers. The Prime Minister had referred to the introduction into Egypt of ideas drawn from Western civilisation. Was it really suggested that nobody could keep a set of books properly and observe ordinary commercial honesty, unless he had the advantage of serving under an English administrator? Lord Cromer had not shown the slightest originality in anything he had done in Egypt. Every idea with which his name was associated was laid before Egypt by the old Egyptian National Assemby. The emancipation of the fellaheen, the abolition of forced labour, the rehabilitation of finance, and the purification of justice—every single item in Lord Cromer's programme of reforms would have been carried out by Egyptian Ministers, but, as things stood, they had been partially fulfilled by a foreign administrator. He would not keep the Committee much longer. [Cheers.] He had no doubt that hon. Members above the gangway would much prefer this Motion to pass without any opportunity for discussion. The more that was said upon it the blacker their case would be found. He thought something more should be said on certain aspects of the Denshawi incident. That incident had resulted in four hangings, two life sentences, and a number of long terms of imprisonment. There had been 400 lashes given to innocent Egyptian villagers. They were asked to give Lord Cromer £50,000, which was a little more than £100 per lash. It had been stated that the trial took place before a special tribunal. He maintained that it was a tribunal tainted through and through with illegality. It was stated in newspaper reports at the time that before Lord Cromer left Egypt for England he had instructed the Minister of the Interior to send a gallows to Denshawi before the trial began. Before this Motion went to a division the House was entitled to some explanation from the Foreign Secretary. He thought the right hon. Gentleman's attitude towards this incident last July was profoundly unsatisfactory. He did not in the least suggest that the right hon. Gentleman had any personal responsibility for the infamous outrage at Denshawi. He believed the Foreign Secretary was a humane man, and that if he had had time to consider the matter the capital sentences would probably not have been carried out. But the right hon. Gentleman stood behind the action of the Judges and officials who ordered these executions, and he had refused to grant the smallest concession of justice to the men still in prison. At first when the incident occurred it was said that Egypt was torn asunder by religious fanaticism, but as soon as responsible people went to investigate the matter, it was found that there was not a shred of foundation for the statement and that contention was given up. Then it was stated that there was profound political unrest, and when that was found to be equally baseless, it was given up. The next report that came to the notice of the House was from a gentleman called Finlay, who stated that this was a brutal and premeditated murder, and that was the evidence on which the House went in supporting the Foreign Secretary. The judicial Report of the special Court abandoned that position completely. He asked the Foreign Secretary to hold out some hope of release for the men still in prison. What was the Government going to do with Egypt in future? The suggestion had been made that it should be annexed and treated as a Crown Colony. [Cheers.] He noticed that suggestion was received with great applause by hon. Members above the gangway. The debate would be followed with more intense interest in Egypt than perhaps hon. Gentlemen above the gangway appreciated. The House was now asked to set the seal of its approval on the policy of Lord Cromer in Egypt. During the first three years Lord Cromer was in Egypt he was under Liberal influence, and they were honourable years. He was afterwards under Tory influence. There was now in Egypt a national movement of respectable character and dimensions. What answer was the House going to make to the reasonable proposal of that national movement? The House had tried elsewhere to subordinate national movements to Imperial sentiment; and he did not suppose that the answer would be a very generous or favourable one. He would always rejoice in two things: that they had failed in Egypt in crushing the national movement, as they had failed in Ireland, and that as an Irish Member he had had the opportuinty of voting and speaking against this subordination, and against this donation and dole to a retired despot.

MR. GRAYSON (York, W.R., Colne Valley) said that the condition of the House presented to him a very interesting and curious spectacle. He saw all the benches packed with enthusiastic politicians, and the Government beaming with the consciousness of their splendid majority. When one heard speeches of a very similar character from both sides of the House one wondered at first what question was being discussed. Had someone discovered the solution of the poverty problem; were they introducing a measure of old-age pensions for incapacitated workmen; or had a rumour slipped out that the new Member was going to make his maiden speech? He perceived what before he came to the House he found it necessary to tell his constituents—that on certain questions both the Government and the Opposition would be found standing together, while on ordinary superficial political questions they would be found in whole-hearted opposition to each other. He did not intend to traverse Lord Cromer's administration in Egypt, but while it gave him gratification that the question of grants for civil political services was at last entertained, as distinguished from grants exclusively for military services, he opposed the Motion, feeling that the Government had no mandate to vote away a large amount of public money for this purpose, whereas it had a mandate to use every cent at its disposal to solve some of the most ghastly social problems. He remembered when the Liberal candidates were fighting at the last General Election it was such promises as they then made in regard to old-age pensions for worn out and incapacitated working men and women that gained for them so great a majority of votes. When he looked around him he realised that the present Government had the most magnificent and glorious opportunity that any Government had ever had; yet enthusiasm could be evoked from those crowded benches, with the united support of the Opposition, on the question of giving a grant to an Egyptian official, while outside the walls of that House people were dying of starvation—men and women who had given good and substantial service to the State were tottering to paupers' graves. He felt that the attitude displayed by even Radical Members of the Government was eloquent of the position which was causing such a revolution in the country at the present time. The Chancellor of the Exchequer found extreme difficulty in finding money for old-age pensions, though he explained pathetically that his heart was right, but that he had not the ability to find money to satisfy the demands of the necessitous poor. The right hon. Gentleman had put aside a half-hearted nucleus to be the basis of a possible scheme of old-age pensions in the future—a nucleus of such small dimensions that it seemed the most futile attempt that could be made by a responsible Minister. Yet, when some great official, who had all his life received a large salary for the services he had rendered, and a pension in addition, was in want of a fortune of £50,000, the result of the labour of the people of this country, the Government had absolutely no difficulty in getting the money. He felt that there must be some underlying reason for the attitude which the Government had adopted that night. Much surprise had been evinced on all sides of the House when a large industrial constituency had left behind it its traditions and clung to some new political doctrine. Was it any wonder to find that the Government was being discredited in the country? The attitude adopted by the Government could not have been better devised if the object had been to help the most revolutionary schemes that had been propounded in the country. Granting that Lord Cromer's services had been resplendent and had conferred everlasting benefit on Egypt, a Government such as that which was now in office might have placed on record their gratitude in some more transcendental manner than by voting £50,000 of public money. What was taking place among the people who were to subscribe the money to be granted to Lord Cromer? The unemployed were walking the streets, men and women able and willing to work were denied that elementary right by the Government now in power. All our constitutional politics were a mockery and a sham while they made no serious attempt to grapple with this problem. He warned hon. Gentlemen opposite that if this policy was persisted in there would not be only one electoral change, but they might look forward to the day when all the front bench would be occupied by Socialists. [Laughter.] That was not a subject for mirth for those who wanted the *status quo*, because under their eyes the most energetic propaganda was being carried on for Socialism, not by the Socialist propaganda, but by the impotent statesmen and the impotent Government who deserted the pledges they gave to the people at the election and entered upon the course of helping its friends. In this his first speech in the House he felt the privilege of having such a night on which to deliver it, and to state the issue clearly and explicitly as it was to be presented to the country. On the one side there was organised capital and organised capitalistic instincts; on the other side organised labour determined to work out its own destiny.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): This House, I am sure, has listened to the hon. Member with the interest and attention which I have never know it fail to give, and which I hope it will never cease to give, to one who addresses it for the first time. If I do not follow the hon. Member in his argument, I trust the hon. Member will believe that it is not because I underrate the sincerity of his feeling, or doubt it, or depreciate the importance of the large problems touched upon. It is because I find it to be difficult to deal with those large problems on this particular Vote in such a way as to advance by practical suggestions or discussion the remedy for the great evils which we all know to exist at home and for which we desire to find remedies in measures of social reform. My intention is rather to bring the debate back to the ground on which it has been placed by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. I think that with one exception the arguments brought against the Vote by the hon. Member for Clare are really answered and anticipated by the speeches of the Prime Minister and the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The one exception is the Denshawi incident. I admit that it is a grave incident, and I do not intend to dismiss it without comment. The hon. Member said that there is no precedent for the Vote. There has been a precedent, but, while admitting that precedents for a grant of this kind and for services of this kind are rare, they are not more rare than Lord Cromer's services in Egypt. This grant is associated with peace and economy. Lord Cromer's services in Egypt would have been remarkable if Egypt was a British Colony in which we had a fair start and a free hand. But instead of having a fair start Lord Cromer had as bad a start as he could possibly have had. He found Egypt overwhelmed with debt, sunk in poverty, its Government corrupt, neither order nor justice known in it. He could get no financial help from the outside. He had to build up a system of good government and progress in the country out of the country's ruined resources. Nor had Lord Cromer a free hand. He was not the Governor of the country. He was charged not to destroy or impair the existing forms of government, and he had to work through the Khedive and native Ministries. It is true that he had behind him the British Army of occupation, and could in any moment of crisis make the British will prevail. But force is not the means by which good government can be built up in any country. It can only be built up by the personal qualities through which Lord Cromer secured his ascendency in Egypt. Time, and a long time, is also necessary for it, and surely what was necessary to a man in Lord Cromer's position was the assurance that our occupation of Egypt, with a force behind him, would be permanent. But that was entirely wanting. He himself did not know, the British Government did not know, how long that occupation was to be continued. A situation of that kind was enough to discourage any ordinary man from putting his hand to the great task to which Lord Cromer put his. It is true that as time went on British Parliaments and Governments extended to Lord Cromer a confidence rarely before extended to any civil servant. But that was not the case at first. He won confidence step by step, and himself created that prestige which is one of the greatest evidences of his success. If to-day the British occupation be accepted at home and abroad, it is not because of the original intention, or the deliberate policy of the British Government; it is mainly due to regard for Lord Cromer's work and the reluctance to imperil it which has confirmed that occupation. It has been suggested that this grant should come from Egyptian funds. I trust that no British representative in Egypt will ever in any way whatever be a burden on Egyptian funds. The work Lord Cromer has done has been admitted at home and abroad, and has created British prestige; and it is the part of the British Government to recompense the valuable work he has done. Gratitude is due to him not only for what he has done in Egypt. The British taxpayer is indebted to him, not only for what he has done, but also for what he has avoided. Few know all the dangers and difficulties from which he has saved this country, and his retirement has exposed this country to risks, which as long as he was in Egypt, were hardly realised. The situation in Egypt was closely connected with foreign policy as a whole, but no one ever interfered less with the general direction of foreign policy than Lord Cromer, who took care to subordinate his own work in Egypt to whatever might be the exigencies of the British Government's policy at home. It is almost impossible to estimate what the burden on the British taxpayer would have been had we had in Egypt in those early years a man less steadfast, less patient, and less sure than Lord Cromer. He had to address himself to the difficult task of reforming Egypt, he had to carry a load of uncertainty with regard to the occupation, he had all the time to do his utmost to avoid foreign complications, and if he has succeeded it has been only by the highest and rarest qualities—wisdom, unfailing courage, and most sovereign faith. And now, to-night, surely what we wish to do is to review his work as a whole. Is it really fair or just to him to take any particular instance of Egyptian administration, to dwell upon it, enlarge upon it, and say that that is a reason why the House of Commons should refuse to recognise the value of his services? The very essence of his position was that he should work steadily for reform in Egypt, and should not attempt to make himself responsible for administrative details. The situation in Egypt was always complicated by the mixture of European and Egyptian officials, the most difficult to work with. Lord Cromer did his utmost to maintain a large proportion of Egyptian officials in order that they might be trained to a sense of public spirit and responsibility, though in earlier years it involved a risk of the miscarriage of administrative details. Lord Cromer has devoted himself to general policy, and it would be most unfair to make him responsible for every detail of Egyptian administration. But now that one detail of Egyptian administration has been singled out, the Denshawi incident, it is very remarkable that it should be one that took place when Lord Cromer was out of the country.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said Lord Cromer had entirely approved what had been done.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am coming to that. The hon. Member for East Tyrone used language which, I think, implied that the sentences had all been arranged by Lord Cromer before he left Egypt. That is absolutely untrue. Lord Cromer did not know what the sentences were till he arrived in this country. But he held, as I myself hold, that the Judges acted with every desire to secure justice; that their motives were pure, and that we ought to abide by their sentence, and he expressed his opinion in a despatch which was laid before the House. The hon. Member for East Clare, if he had read the whole of it, would have done a little more justice to what Lord Cromer's view of the subject is. He upheld the conduct and action of the Judges, and expressed his opinion that some reform should be introduced into the special tribunal. He abolished flogging in Egypt; and this is the only instance for many years where flogging has taken place. This special tribunal was brought into existence ten years before or more.

Mr. GWYNN: Is it right to say that Lord Cromer abolished flogging in Egypt? In his despatch he blamed Lord Dufferin for having done so.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Perhaps the hon. Member is correct, that Lord Dufferin abolished flogging; but during Lord Cromer's time in Egypt flogging was not in the penal code; and if the hon. Member says that Lord Dufferin was the first to abolish it, I am quite willing to accept that. There had been no flogging in Egypt, except under this special tribunal, for many years. As to the Denshawi incident itself, I really think that it is not relevant to this particular Vote. It is most unfair to take a single isolated incident, of which the knowledge reached Lord Cromer later than it reached us, and to make that a peg on which to hang a depreciation of the whole of his work in Egypt. This case, however, has been dealt with, and I wish to say that I do not think the hon. Member for East Clare gave a fair account of it to the House. The sentences on the Denshawi offenders were passed after a public trial, in which no restrictions were placed upon the counsel for the defence. What were the actual circumstances? Some British officers went to shoot pigeons at the village of Denshawi. The rule is that they are not to shoot pigeons in any village without previously obtaining permission from the head of the village. In the previous year permission had been given, and on this occasion the officers were led to believe that permission had again been given, and that the shooting had been sanctioned by the village authorities. The hon. Member for East Clare said these officers ignored the wishes of the people. If so they did it unwittingly, and directly objection was taken they desisted. Even when they were mobbed they did not attempt to defend themselves and gave up their guns. I think it is most unfair for the hon. Member for East Clare to bring any charge against the conduct of the officers. The hon. Member said the officers should have been punished. That was most unfair, because they were given to understand that they had permission from the head of the village to shoot the pigeons and they began to shoot, but directly they were told that they were wrong they desisted shooting, and gave up their guns. The guns were taken from the officers, who did not fire them. What is the state of things at the present moment? Several men are now in prison under very long sentences, some for fifteen years and some for life. The men who are now in prison are all persons who took part in the violent and brutal attack upon these officers. One officer lost his life, and another was so injured that he did not recover for a very long time, if he has yet recovered, and he had to be invalided home. For that attack the men actually in prison have been there for one year. I do not think anybody can say that one year is too long a time for anyone to be kept in prison for participating in an attack persisted in with great brutality against men who were unarmed at the time they were attacked. The number of prisoners is no doubt large, and I can well conceive that it may be urged that the real people who planned the attack and were responsible for it have been executed, and that some of those now in prison were led away by the feeling of excitement at the moment to do more than they fully realised at the time. But men must be held responsible for the consequences of their acts, and although I do not for one moment say on the part of the British Government that there would be any opposition to a reconsideration of these sentences at the proper time, a year after the event is too soon to make any promise of that kind, and if the sentences are revised it must be done by the deliberate and calm opinion of the Egyptian Government at a time when the exercise of clemency is likely to have a good effect.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I am sure that the right hon. Baronet does not wish to treat me unfairly in this matter. Does he say that before the assault on these officers took place a woman and two men had not been shot?

Sir EDWARD GREY: Oh, yes, Sir, I do. An officer began to shoot pigeons. He was then mobbed. He stopped shooting pigeons directly he found that there was any objection. He was mobbed the people took his gun from him, and after he had been mobbed and the gun taken from him the gun went off. [Nationalist cries of "Oh, oh!"] All the Papers have been laid before the House. What I object to is any imputation upon the conduct of the officers who did all they could in the matter. That is fully borne out by the evidence at the trial which has been laid before the House. When I come to review Egyptian administration and consider the various questions which are asked me with regard to it, one thing which strikes me is that those questions are based upon the assumption that the administration of Egypt is being judged by the high standard of government which we apply to ourselves at home. It is Lord Cromer's work alone which has made that possible, and if you judge his work by the standard which existed before he went there—take the Egyptian Army or any department of government you like—there is no criticism you can make. The work has been carried out by British advisers and British and European officials, but Lord Cromer has proved that native material and native administration is not only workable but is also a great instrument of progress. Nothing is more untrue than to say that he has treated the Egyptians as an inferior race. He has constantly enjoined on British officials that they are to treat the natives with respect, sympathy, tact, and discretion. It has been his object constantly to draw the Egyptians more and more to bear their share in the Government of their country. No fair-minded man can fail to have been struck by the fact that that is the governing note which he has persistently followed in his policy. As to the actual amount of the grant, the Government do not, of course, propose it to the House as an adequate measure of Lord Cromer's services. It is impossible to measure by a cash payment services such as he has rendered over a large number of years. It would be invidious to attempt it.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Why make the attempt then?

Sir EDWARD GREY: The circumstances of the post in Egypt have been exceptional. The salary of £6,500 has been in later years much too small for the expenses of the post, which have grown very largely with the prosperity of Egypt. The expenses of the post having grown, it is at the present moment impossible to hold it without spending a considerable private income. That is really spent on the public service, and that is what Lord Cromer has had to do. The pension he gets from the Government is £900 a year. The pension of an ambassador after thirteen years service would be £1,700. Lord Cromer, with twenty-four years service, which is at least equal to that of any ambassador both in results and importance, receives £900 because he has been a consul-general and not an ambassador. I think it is absolutely wrong that there should be this difference. The post in Egypt is at least equal to any embassy. That is the state of things at the present time. It was always understood that when Lord Cromer retired from his post he would receive a larger pension. But the Government have preferred that there should be special recognition on a very special occasion, and, instead of coming to the House for any special provision in the way of pension, they decided to propose a grant to Lord Cromer, and to limit the sum to £50,000. Surely, of all men, it may be said that he has created wealth for others. [An Hon. Member: "Let them pay him."] He has created wealth for others, being careful all the time that the wealth he created in Egypt should be distributed among the people of Egypt. Somebody has mentioned the Stock Exchange in connection with Lord Cromer's work in Egypt. No man has been more careful that Stock Exchange speculators should not get the benefit, and anyone who reads page 100 of the last Report will realise how strenuous Lord Cromer has been to ensure that, in the development of the wealth of Egypt, it will not be the speculator or the promoter, or the Stock Exchange, but the fellaheen, who will reap the benefit. It has always been the ambition of this House as a whole to deal with great services in a generous spirit. The House as a whole has never been narrow or grudging in recognising real merit, and, though there has been opposition from some quarters to this Vote, I would appeal to the House to pass the Vote in a really generous spirit, recognising thereby what has been the most distinguished and honourable public service abroad which has come before the House of Commons in our time.

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside) said the right hon. Gentleman had advanced some very weighty arguments in support of the grant, and he had also, like some previous speakers, created some difficulty for those who wished to hold the balance evenly between the two sides. It was a little unfortunate, at least from his point of view, that Lord Cromer had been referred to by the supporters of the grant in language of such unstinted panegyric. One was not surprised that the Prime Minister in moving such a Vote should have used language of panegyric, and that he should be seconded in similar terms from the front Opposition bench. The fact remained that the language used in these panegyrics could not possibly be the ultimate verdict of history. They often heard expressions used in debate as to what the verdict of history would be. History was not ultimately written by front benchers, nor were the estimates of what constituted great men, which were so freely proffered in the House, the estimates by which they would be regarded in the future. [Interruption and cries of "Order!"]

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Order among the bondholders.

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON said he had not risen to make an attack on Lord Cromer. His special purpose in rising was to indicate the reasons for not making an attack on Lord Cromer. He simply wished to state that a difficulty had been put in the way of those who were not going to oppose the grant, by the panegyrics which had been passed on Lord Cromer. The Foreign Secretary had made a speech by way of general answer to a number of particular questions, but he was bound to say that the right hon. Gentleman seemed to proceed on the assumption that we had a right to ask in regard to Egypt as high a standard of good government as we exacted in our own affairs. That seemed to be an explicit admission, and he was glad to recognise the reasonable tone of it. Egypt was clearly not getting the standard of good government which we exacted in this country. For instance, there was the strongest disposition on the part of hon. Members on the Opposition benches to resent any questions in regard to Egyptian matters. Hon. Members seemed to form their opinions without the smallest possible knowledge of Egyptian affairs. They applauded the right hon. Gentleman when he said that penny postage was impossible on account of the coinage. But penny stamps did exist. But on the other hand the right hon. Gentleman had alleged that in every department of Egyptian administration there was a vast improvement. He ventured to think that the right hon. Gentleman did not look with sufficient minuteness into some departments of Egyptian administration. He did not go so far as hon. Gentlemen opposite. [Cries of "Divide!"] He had listened to a great deal of irrelevant eloquence on the other side of the House, and he did not propose to abandon his opportunity of stating his views on this subject. [Renewed cries of "Divide!"] He would not say with hon. Members opposite that there was any deliberate suppression of education in Egypt; but he did say that there had been in Egypt a failure to maintain higher education at the level which Lord Cromer found there. He did not wish to press further the line of criticism of the administration. The right hon. Gentleman urged that the Denshawi episode was not strictly relevant to the discussion, but notwithstanding that he went on to defend it at such length as to carry the balance the other way. The Denshawi incident lay at the door of this nation and Government, and if there were any censuring to be done it would have to include the Foreign Secretary himself, who practically endorsed the episode. The right hon. Gentleman had bestowed on him his censure for saying a few plain truths with regard to the affair, and even announced that one of the officials concerned would be promoted. That official had been promoted. If this Vote was to be made an occasion for something in the nature of a retribution of Lord Cromer the censure should include the Home Government. And, what was more, this House had made itself party to an absolutely autocratic system of government, of which the natural result was such an abuse of justice as that afforded by the Denshawi affair. To denounce the grant in face of such a position was to strain at a gnat and to swallow a camel. No matter what a man's abilities were—and those of Lord Cromer had been on some grounds over-estimated—no man could act as an autocrat without suffering deterioration in several respects. [Continued cries of "Divide!" during which the hon. Member's remarks were inaudible.]

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby), on a point of order, wished to ask whether hon. Members opposite were justified in persisting in their remarks to the extent that had been indulged in while another Member was speaking.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he could not say it was out of order to call "Divide!" for the practice had been indulged in for many years past. He did not think, however, that it often tended to the shortening of the proceedings.

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON said he had never used the expression "Divide," although he had had sometimes at least as much cause as hon. Members had against him at present. He really wished to say a word which he thought was not opposed to the line they had taken that night. In so far as it had been suggested that this grant should be withheld from Lord Cromer because of the miserable misdeed at Denshawi, he ventured to say that such a retribution was ill-calculated and did not represent a policy of which the House should be proud. The Denshawi event should be a warning against all attempts of retribution. It arose out of a moderate attempt at retribution, which ended in a tragedy and was succeeded by an abominable revenge. This nation, having created an autocracy in Egypt, having sent Lord Cromer to occupy the post so created, and having backed up the system of which Lord Cromer was the representative, was not entitled to haggle at the business of giving a grant.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 254 ; Noes, 107. (Division List No. 350.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, RtHn.SirAlex. F.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Ashley, W. W.
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,RedmondJ.(Tyrone,N.)
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowles, G. Stewart
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T.(Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil,Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies,David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar,SirJ.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder,SirJohn P.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, James
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, George Denison (York)

Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harmsworth, R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hervey, F.W.F. (BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morpeth, Viscount
Morse, L. L.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Severns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Lverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wodehouse, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Alden, Percy
Barnes, G. N.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Byles, William Pollard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher

Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hudson, Walter
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
Maddison, Frederick
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Snowden, P.
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, William
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. William Redmond and Mr. Arthur Henderson.

Resolution to be reported upon Thursday; Committee to sit again To-morrow (Wednesday).

———

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Lords' Amendments be now considered."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said it would not be necessary that he should actually make the Motion standing in his name on the Order Paper,† because those of them who had considered the Amendments did not propose to take more than one division, and it had been decided, he believed, to divide on one of the other Amendments. Therefore he would make the observations which he proposed to make on the Amendments generally on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman that the Amendments be considered. Personally he was hostile to the Bill, as his right hon. friend knew, but it would be out of order to discuss the Bill as a whole on that occasion, and if not no one would wish to undertake to do so at that period of the session. The House of Lords was a chamber of revision, so it was claimed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but it must be a little perplexing to its friends when considered as a revising body, because of the extraordinary loose nature of its proceedings when amending Bills. In the case of all important Bills Amendments were made not only on the stages familiar to the House of Commons, but also after the Third Reading of the Bills. No report came to them in the Commons of the precise form in which the Amendments were made, and the newspapers only gave brief reports. Therefore they had to do the best they could under most difficult circumstances. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill considered that the Amendments which had been made were, on the whole, an improvement or not on his Bill, or would affect his scheme, which was, of course, not in the Bill, but was to be found only in his speeches. To his own mind these Amendments were partly ungrammatical, partly contradictory, partly meaningless, and in some cases they had the exactly opposite effect to that which was intended by their authors. Some of the Amendments were improvements, but on the whole he thought they left the Bill very much in the position where it stood before. They were not important Amendments; they did not change the fabric of the Bill; but he would like the candid opinion of the Financial Secretary to the War Office as to the financial side of them. He would deal now only with the principal Amendments; and they did not appear to him to proceed upon any well-considered plan. There were three which he wished to mention to the House, the first of which was the result of certainly two, and he believed three, changes in another place. On the Committee stage of the Bill, Lord Haversham moved an Amendment, which was immediately accepted as an improvement. It was an Amendment which introduced election by the local authority of the Territorial Army as against appointment by the War Office. But on the Report stage Lord Erroll rose and moved, without explanation, an Amendment to the Amendment, which partly reversed the Amendment previously accepted by the Government. Immediately on that Motion being made, without a single word of explanation, Lord Portsmouth, on behalf of the Government, accepted it. The result was that a very small Amendment in the Bill appeared before the House of Commons, representing this curious double change. On the second Amendment being accepted Lord Haversham got up and denounced the Government for their sudden change of front, and he (Sir C. Dilke) hoped that now or later on, when the Amendment was reached, they would have an explanation from the Government as to what the change meant. He would not attempt to anticipate the debate on the Amendment with regard to which notice had been given by the hon. Member for Leicester. But to that proposition in regard to military education in schools, he personally had always had objections, on the military grounds which were so well stated in a former debate by the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool. But there was an additional objection to it in the form in which it had now been placed in the Bill which concerned a matter raised in that House by three hon. Members opposite and by himself. They had some fear that the intention of the Army Council under this Bill was to get rid of all expenditure from Army Votes for the Volunteers, and to spend all the money obtained from Army Votes on the Regular Army. That contention was never allowed there, and when they pressed their right hon. friend as to whether it was the intention to "send round the hat," as it was called, on behalf of the county association, he repudiated that suggestion. The only other Amendment which he thought it necessary to name in this connection concerned the Territorial cavalry. The authors attached great importance to this Amendment, although the change was a very slight one—as it raised the optional maximum of cavalry training by a term of three days. It appeared from the debate that the noble Lords who made that proposal thought they were affecting the efficiency of the divisional cavalry. One thing they had hoped that the Lords, if ineffective as a revising chamber, would have accomplished in their debates was to have obtained the exact nature of the divisional cavalry proposals. But they were still in ignorance as to those proposals. But although the debate in the other House turned entirely on that point, the Amendment before them could not possibly affect it, for the words used did not affect the divisional cavalry at all. They were outside the ordinary constitution of the Yeomanry and the cavalry of the Territorial Army, and the Amendment was so worded that it referred only to the cavalry of the Territorial Army. He would name one other subject, though he did not know whether he would be in order, for it was not any Amendment that had been made, but the fact that a large portion of the Bill had been passed without Amendment, that he wished to draw attention to. It had been passed entirely without Amendment, though an Amendment had been proposed and hotly debated. He was referring to the vexed controverted question, how far the Bill, through the clauses headed "Civil Rights," applied any new form of military law in time of peace to the Volunteers. That was a legal question of great difficulty, and a wholly different view was taken of it in another place, while a different view of it was taken in another place by the spokesman of the Government from that of the Government in the House of Commons. The question was, however, not covered by any Amendment, so they would not be in order in debating it that night. He would ask leave to address questions to his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War on certain Amendments.

---

† "That the Lords' Amendments be considered upon this day three months."

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said he wished to express his agreement with the right hon. Baronet when he said he disagreed with the Bill and that it was an entirely unnecessary measure. He had said that repeatedly when the Bill was passing through the House, and he still adhered to that opinion, though he considered that the Bill had been greatly improved as a result of its consideration in another place. He would have been glad if the Bill had been more altered and if the changes had been more drastic. In another place the constitution of the County Associations had been discussed. In the House of Commons it was not possible to discuss them, for the closure was applied when only the first few Amendments had been dealt with. The closure was most ruthlessly applied, and they were indebted to the fact that there was another place where the procedure was different, and where the closure was not applied in the form in which it was applied in that House. Several explanations were given by the Government as to the constitution and working of the County Associations, and some must have been suggested by the Lords' Amendments. There was one matter on which he would like to express his gratitude to the Secretary of State for War, and that was for the great courtesy he had shown as regarded the transfer of the property of the Volunteer corps, a matter which had agitated many corps who were possessed of considerable property. He thought they would have no difficulty on that score. He earnestly hoped that when they came to the clause which the right hon. Baronet had indicated there would be a serious debate. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would stick to his guns. The right hon. Gentleman had appealed to the country, he had appealed to a nation in arms, and he had done all that he could to encourage the spirit of military discipline among the more youthful of the population. He earnestly hoped that, if any opposition was attempted to the Amendments made in another place, the right hon. Gentleman would not run away [from his own opinions, as he did when the measure was introduced. It seemed absurd to take a measure which was of such immense importance, altering the whole constitution of the Auxiliary Forces and of the National defence, at that late hour of the night. Ministers were jaded, as they could all see, after sitting through the previous night. To propose seriously to consider a matter of that importance at half-past twelve in the morning was scandalous, and he protested against it in the strongest possible terms. He earnestly hoped the Secretary of State for War would not give way on any Amendment because of the lateness, or the earliness, of the hour, and that he would adhere to the Amendments accepted by the Government in another place, particularly that with regard to the training of boys in military discipline.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said that if the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean was serious, it appeared that the main debate would take place on the amount of assistance which was or was not to be given to the training of boys of a certain age in schools of a certain character. They would have another opportunity of discussing it, so he would say no more on the point then. About one of the observations of the right hon. Baronet he would, however, like to say something. The right hon. Gentleman had adverted to the Amendment which extended the presumptive period of maximum training. If he rightly followed the right hon. Gentleman, he said he could not understand the differentiation because it had no relation to the matter which they had discussed in the House, or to any conclusion they had arrived at. The real question was whether the Yeomanry forces were to be altogether outside the Yeomanry of the Special Reserves or not. They had debated that point very well but had never arrived at any conclusion. The Secretary of State had left the impression that he might change his mind in regard to the matter. He thought that if the right hon. Gentleman would address himself to that point before considering the other special matters he would go far to satisfy them on a matter which was of great public interest. Whatever decision they might reach in regard to the matter, his opinion was that it would be a great pity to make the presumptive period sixteen days instead of eighteen days. Eighteen days would not be too much.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords' Amendments considered.

Lords' Amendment—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Regulars, to insert the words 'and their Reserves'"—

read a second time.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that was a very loose phrase. Was it a Government phrase? It meant the Reserve of the Regulars and was not the usual wording.

MR. HALDANE'S reply was inaudible.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked the right hon. Gentleman to let the House know what his reply was.

Question put, and agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In page 2, line 1, after the word 'or,' to insert the words 'failing him'"—

read a second time.

MR. WYNDHAM asked the right hon. Gentleman to reply now to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. As he understood the Amendment, it did make a change. Were they to understand that it was only when the Lord-Lieutenant was considered to be unfit that they were to look elsewhere? Or were they to understand that the Lord-Lieutenant and any other person were on an equal plane? He took it to mean that the Lord-Lieutenant was the proper person, and wished to know if that was the Government view.

MR. HALDANE said the Amendment was inserted as a result of discussion. As far as he, observing from an outside position, could appreciate the debate in the House of Lords they wanted some words to make the precise meaning clear and chose these words so that if the lord-lieutenant was not available somebody else should be made president of the association.

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In line 18, after the word 'appointment' to insert the words 'by the Army Council during the first three years after the passing of this Act and subsequently for the election'"—read a second time.

MR. HALDANE said about that line 18 he would explain what the situation was, as there seemed to be an inaccurate impression as to what had taken place in another place. An Amendment was moved to make the position elective, but the Government could not agree, as they felt that there would be so much difficulty and confusion if the Army Council were not to make the selection. The House of Lords thought otherwise, and pressed that view, but later the House of Lords reflected and found that there was a great deal more in what the Government said than they had at first thought, and the clause was modified so as to leave the first election to the Army Council and subsequent elections to the County Associations. The Army Council would not interfere.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: The right hon. Gentleman says "on reflection." Lord Portsmouth got up at once and said he accepted it. Then Lord Haversham, Lord Donoughmore, Lord Newton, and Lord Landsdowne attacked it. I do not think there was much reflection.

MR. WYNDHAM said it seemed to him that the Army Council to all intents would be the people who appointed the chairman and the vice-chairman. They would draw up the scheme. In another place a scheme was put forward by which provision was made for appointment by the Army Council for three years and then by election of the association.

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In page 4, line 19, after the word 'assistance,' to insert the words 'out of money voted by Parliament.'"—read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD moved: "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment." In doing so he drew attention to the way in which the clause was settled by that House. The right hon. Gentleman would remember that various Amendments were put on the Paper to the clause as originally drafted, but that owing to the operation of the guillotine it was impossible to discuss any one of them. The right hon. Gentleman would also remember that they entered into negotiations with him, and that as the result of those negotiations the clause as it left the House was drafted. He would submit to the right hon. Gentleman that a clause formed after negotiation of that character ought not to have been the subject of negotiation in another place. An agreement was come to between the right hon. Gentleman and certain Members in the House of Commons, and by virtue of that agreement certain things happened. The clause was passed by a bargain and not by a majority. No sooner, however, did the Bill go to the other House than the right hon. Gentleman entered into negotiations with opponents of the Bill, and now an Amendment was produced which certainly he and his friends did not accept, and which did not carry out the original arrangement come to. He would like to say that if they were going to have cadet corps it was very much less objectionable that they should be paid for by public money than by the scheme of the Amendment. He was opposed to cadet corps. He was not going to raise the question at that hour, but he would say that underlying their objection to that particular Amendment was the general objection to cadet corps. There were two bodies of expert opinion opposed to cadet corps. The first body of such expert opinion was expert military opinion, because it was becoming more and more apparent, and the French experiments showed it, that to teach children under the age of sixteen military drill was to damage their military possibilities rather than improve them. The second body of expert opinion opposed to military drill was expert educational opinion. It had been shown—and he was glad to say that up-to-date educational authorities were now withdrawing military drill from their schools because it was not suited to the physical development of the children—that such drill put a certain strain upon certain parts of the physique of a child and that, so far from aiding physical development, it retarded and destroyed it. The good soldier and the good educationist were ranging themselves more and more completely and emphatically against the proposal of cadet corps. But the clause as amended was a definite invitation to the County Association to enter over the heads of the educational authority and practically compel educational authorities to allow the establishment of cadet corps in the school. They knew quite well what influence would be brought to bear upon these educational authorities. Such a clause in an Act of Parliament had got to be taken into account in connection with all the social circumstances of the Bill. The Amendment would be practically a mandate on every educational authority to allow the County Associations to step in and establish cadet corps in connection with every elementary school in the country. They knew pretty well the sort of propaganda that would be carried on. They saw it in the case of the Navy League. The Navy League maps came into every elementary school. Advertisements of the League stared one in the face from the walls. Leaflets were spread from one end of the country to the other, and school books were being written for the special purpose of carrying on that propaganda. The Amendment would augment that propaganda by one more insidious still, a propaganda of cadet corps. Of course, there was a distinction. The Liberal Government was a Government of class distinction. It gave special privileges for the son of the rich parent attending a private preparatory or public school. The children of rich parents were to have their military drill paid from funds supplied by the State. The children of poor parents were to have their military drill paid for from charitable funds supplied by touting associations going round the rich county magnates appealing to them to supply money and to supply toy muskets to the children of poor parents attending public elementary schools for which no fees had to be paid. Had there been no guillotine in operation, he and his friends would have challenged this matter at the time, and the clause would have been modified. The effect of the Amendment was to establish military drill, and to establish it under the patronage of the private rich people, instead of under the patronage of the State. Was the cadet corps movement good or was it bad ? If it was good the Secretary for War should make it part and parcel of military training. He should pay for it from military funds; he should put it under the control of the County Associations; he should say to the County Associations, "This is part and parcel of the Territorial Force; this is a great recruiting ground; this is a reservoir to feed the Army with." Its expenses ought to be allocated from precisely the same sources as those of other sections of the Territorial Force. If, on the other hand, the right hon. Gentleman wished them to believe that cadet corps were of no military value, let him keep them out of the Bill. Let him not run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Let him not meet the National Service League with one hand and the opponents of this proposal with the other. Let him not tell the National Service League, "I will secure military training," and then tell the Labour Party, "Military training will be secured, but not at the public expense." If the work of the cadet corps was national let the country pay for it; if it was of the least use let Parliament pay for it from public money. If it was not national and not of the least use, let them have nothing to do with it. This, he supposed, was what was called a compromise upon reflection. The other place changed its Amendment. The other place, he supposed on reflection, considered that Mr. Speaker might have something to say to the first Amendment. It might have been suggested to Mr. Speaker that the first Amendment was a breach of the privileges of the House of Commons. He supposed that the other place came to the decision that the right hon. Gentleman was more squeezable than Mr. Speaker, and so the second Amendment was put on the Paper. That Amendment meant that everything they wanted was going to be secured under a most objectionable form. The Labour Party objected to it root and branch, and they would press their opposition to a division. He was glad to be assured of the support of hon. Members above the gangway on that side of the House. On 29th May this question was raised by two or three hon. Members above the gangway. The Member for Maidstone made a most forcible speech opposing the idea of the hat going round in order to find funds for the work of the County Associations. The hon. Member for the Newport Division pointed out that it was unfair that one association should be placed in opposition to another in rival subscribing adventures, in order to be more efficient to carry on their work. The junior Member for the City of London thought it was a most extraordinary thing to introduce in a national Army Bill a clause whereby permission was given to send round the hat asking for subscriptions to the Army as though it were a hospital or a voluntary school. The hon. Member for Oswestry raised precisely this point, because he said he wanted to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether if he left a legacy to encourage cadet battalions attached to public schools, a County Association would be able to accept it and spend it for that purpose. The right hon. Gentleman rather eluded the point, he would talk about anything but the proposed cadet corps. The right hon. Gentleman's position, however, was perfectly clear. He told them in words which would only bear constructively one meaning that he was opposed to the hat going round in any shape or form. But now this most important part of military training was going to be founded on and supported by the passing of the hat. If after being passed round the hat was found to be empty there was going to be no cadet corps at all attached to public schools. What an absurd position this was for a Minister who said he was opposed to the hat going round, and was opposed to degrading County Associations by asking them to appeal for subscriptions. Though they could not knock the cadet corps out the Labour Party would certainly make an attempt to knock the hat out. The right hon. Gentleman got his clause through the House before as the result of an amicable arrangement which the Labour Party thought would be kept to, and under the circumstances he would have no hesitation in pressing the matter to a division.

MR. HALDANE said that the hon. Member for Leicester had indulged in some flights of imagination into which he would not attempt to follow him. He was of a less romantic disposition than the hon. Member and would come to the ground speedily if he tried to follow his example. In the first place the hon. Member said that he as Secretary of State for War had made an arrangement with regard to this matter. He had, however, made no arrangement of the kind suggested with the hon. Member for Leicester or his friends. What did happen was this. He had had negotiations with certain hon. friends of his own in the House about the form which that clause should take. The Bill passed with the clause in that form, but when it got to the other place the majority there struck out the words which had been put in and restored the clause to its original form. He took council with his hon. friends with whom he had consulted before, and after discussing the matter they agreed that if they could induce the House of Lords by such arguments as they were able to bring forward to put the clause back into the form in which it was now, that was to restrict the use of public money for the purpose, they would do very well. None of them thought that the question of the contribution of private money was very serious, and none of them thought that the clause was open to the imaginary evils sketched by the hon. Member for Leicester in such vivid tints The clause authorised County Associations to co-operate in establishing and assisting cadet battalions and other corps. There was no power of any sort or kind to go into board schools against the will of the school. The association became merely the porters of any gift, so that anything like what the hon. Member for Liecester had been painting to the House in such vivid colours was impossible. They had a stiff debate in the House of Lords, and in the end they had the opportunity of settling the matter. The Government were prepared to press for the clause which he had settled upon with his hon. friends at the previous negotiations, but in the end the majority in the House of Lords, though not until after a good deal of discussion, agreed to give them the clause in the form in which it now appeared, provided that they stuck to the bargain when the Bill came back to the House of Commons. The Earl of Crewe, on behalf of the Government and with the consent of the Prime Minister, gave the undertaking which was asked for by Lord Lansdowne. That undertaking having been given, the Government meant to carry it out loyally on the present occasion. He stated with every confidence that the Government had done the best thing for the clause and for the Bill as a whole.

MR. WYNDHAM rather wished that the right hon. Gentleman had postponed his intervention in the debate for a few minutes. This clause, in common with almost every other clause in the Bill, was not obviously intelligible at first sight. Now that it had received its final emendation at the hands of His Majesty's Government, or at any rate with their consent, he need hardly say that the Opposition would support the Government in their resolve to accept the Amendment made in the other place. In the view of the Opposition that Amendment went some way to express, however clumsily, their wish that Parliament should make some declaration in favour of cadet corps in the schools of the country. The Amendment made in another place, and its acceptance by His Majesty's Government, would be understood outside the House of Commons as a declaration that the Government had gone part of the way back to the position they originally occupied. He could not, however, hide his agreement with much that fell from the hon. Member for Leicester. He thought they were entitled to know definitely from the Government what their policy was. Here was a large question of vast public interest. Was it or was it not a good thing that children below the age of sixteen years should have some military training? The

Opposition believed that the bulk of the opinion in the country was in agreement with them in thinking that it was a good thing. The hon. Gentleman had not got to the bottom of all the ambiguities which were characteristic of the Bill. The hon. Member for Leicester raised three questions in his speech. The last was that the Bill in its present shape proposed an invidious distinction between the schools to which the children of the poorer of their fellow-subjects went and the schools to which the children of the richer classes went. The Opposition noticed that when the Bill was under discussion in the House of Commons, and they thought it most unfortunate that in a Bill dealing with such a vital matter as our national defence such class distinctions should be drawn. That was a fatal blot on the Bill, and the hon. Member for Leicester was right when he said that the Government were drawing an invidious distinction. Was it not an invidious distinction to contribute out of public funds for one type of school and not for another? The hon. Member for Leicester raised another question. He stated that they ought to have a clear issue before them, and that those of them who thought this training was good should have an opportunity of saying so, and that those who thought it was bad should also have an opportunity of saying so. That opportunity had been denied to them by the right hon. Gentleman, as it had been denied on every previous occasion. The hon. Member for Leicester had not got to the bottom of the elusiveness of the right hon. Gentleman. The Bill as it stood asserted that these associations were to establish and assist cadet corps in every school. That was still the policy of the Government, and therefore the Government had not in the Bill, even as it now stood, made any concession, in his opinion. In the opinion of His Majesty's Government it was the duty of these associations to establish and assist cadet corps and rifle corps. The only limitations were in respect of persons under sixteen years of age in schools of a certain type. Any person over sixteen in a school receiving a Parliamentary grant might be assisted out of public funds. Any person under sixteen in another school of another type might be assisted out of public funds. To call that a compromise was a somewhat strange use of the term. It was a mere muddle. The Government intended that the military education of the young should be part and parcel of their plan for making a national Army, but their views met with considerable hostility in the quarter from which the hon. Member for Leicester spoke, and they put in a kind of limitation which really gave the hon. Member for Leicester nothing. He did not think the hon. Member had lost by it. All that had happened on this clause, as on so many others, was that the Government set out with one intention, and while pursuing it they endeavoured to persuade some of their supporters that they had abandoned it.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said that as he had taken some interest in this question, and had spoken strongly on the subject the last time it was before the House, he trusted the House would forgive him if he said a word now. He was quite impenitent as to the view he had expressed of the total absence of military advantage in training young people to either military drill or rifle shooting. He was not alone in that opinion. Instances given by the hon. Member for Leicester showed that an extremely military nation like France held the same view. He did not think attention had been called to a remarkable book by Colonel Maude, whom one might call a Jingo of the Jingoes, an enthusiast for military matters beside whom all hon. Members opposite were comparatively tame. Colonel Maude strongly took the view which he had endeavoured to put before the House on previous occasions. He (Major Seely) was strongly opposed to the training of youths in either drill or military exercises as being of no military advantage. He would not weary the House by giving reasons again. Let it suffice to say he did not believe it tended to make people more patriotic or more earnest in their endeavours to receive military training if practically forced to it when young. But the situation that had arisen was an interesting one. He agreed that it was inadvisable to send round the hat, but he did not agree with the hon. Member for Leicester that they should take objection to the Lords' Amendments and jeopardise the Bill, because he did not think the hon. Gentleman had lost anything by the change. First of all, the hat had to go round and to be filled, and, secondly, the education authority had to desire that the children should be taught this drill.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: Not necessarily.

MAJOR SEELY: As it stands at present. I appeal to the Secretary to the Board of Education if that is not so. You must get their consent.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): That is so.

MAJOR SEELY said he thought they must get the consent of the Board of Education. Simultaneously the hat had to go round and be filled. Supposing the House rejected this, how much better off would be the position of the hon. Member for Leicester? The hat would still go round and the boys would be taught drill and rifle shooting by the consent of the Board of Education, only instead of the hat being sent round by the County Association it would be sent round by the Lord-Lieutenant and the other enthusiasts acting as private individuals. In regard to the funds, if they could not be collected and distributed by the County Association they could be collected and distributed equally well by the individual members who would be appointed for that purpose. If there really was enthusiasm for this military movement, which he hoped there was not, as it would be of no military value, although he agreed that the spirit it evoked was excellent, it would be perfectly impossible to check cadet corps by this Amendment, or the sending round of the hat. What, then, was the purpose of jeopardising the Bill on which they had spent so much time? If the hon. Member would propose an Amendment at any time which raised the whole issue he would go into the division lobby with him. He objected to spending public money in this matter, but he did not think cadet corps were bad in themselves, and to throw out the possibility of the solution offered would be most unwise.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that in common with those who had spoken he joined with the hon. Member for Leicester in the view that no particular gratitude was due to the Secretary for War for his very grudging concession, which he fancied the right hon. Gentleman had largely arranged in another place. He was responsible for an Amendment that was moved on the only occasion it was possible to raise it, and which attempted to bring back the Bill into the region of that clear-thinking of which the right hon. Gentleman spoke so much when he introduced the Bill. Unfortunately, by those subterranean negotiations the process of clear-thinking was abandoned by the right hon. Gentleman, and as a concession to a small band of extremists who seemed to think that any sort of training or discipline at once turned our youth into swashbucklers, the right hon. Gentleman put a clause into his Bill which very distinctly changed the whole position. They had been told that expert military opinion was against cadet corps. He would appeal to one expert military opinion which the hon. and gallant Member would not deny. About five years ago he was a member of a Royal Commission before which the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division appeared, and the hon. and gallant Member gave the strongest evidence in favour of rifle shooting and corps for the young, telling them of the successful results of his own experiments. He would go to even more expert military opinion than the hon. and gallant Member. The Secretary of State for War as late as this spring appointed a military committee in the War Office to deal with the question of cadet corps, and he actually allowed boys of fifteen to gain certificates, and as recently as the month of May last the right hon. Gentleman issued a circular to all the schools of England, in which he offered certain advantages in the event of boys qualifying for such certificate. He called together the teachers in these schools no later than about a couple of months ago. His proposals were accepted with gratitude on every side; the heads of these schools distinctly informed him that they thought they could do much to realise the object which he had so much at heart—a nation trained in arms. Less than six weeks later, in obedience to that small band of members, and to its subterranean communications, he withdrew the offer he had made to these teachers. The hon. Member for Leicester had stated that educational experts were against them, but he would like to know where they were to be found? In the vast majority of the schools something of this military training had been introduced. It was spreading rapidly, and in scarcely a single instance—he could speak from his own knowledge—had they anything but the most favourable reports from the teachers as to the results of the cadet corps. It was not merely a question of training the boys; it was for its educational advantages, as much as anything else, that it was an object to be pursued. All the most eminent educational experts told them that the greatest waste in the youth of our country, the greatest loss in all that we were paying for, the greatest casting away of all the results of the time, and trouble and money spent on education, occurred precisely in the years between fourteen and sixteen. They could get hold of the youths in no other way except by organising them into something like these cadet corps. By that means they could get hold of these boys during the most dangerous period of their lives. But they were told by the hon. Member for Leicester, "You are introducing an invidious social distinction." That was very true, but who were to blame for that? The Secretary of State for War and the hon. Member for Leicester and his friends, who were responsible for this change. There was plenty of money in the larger public schools in England, and there they would have no difficulty with the cadet corps, for the upper and the wealthier classes sent their children there. But they would lose the advantage of this training in military discipline for the humbler schools, where they were closing the door against it and making it possible only at the hands of charity. Did the right hon. Gentleman really think that this clause excluded only elementary schools? Did he not know that there were hundreds of middle class schools—not elementary schools at all—who nevertheless did share in the Parliamentary grants? The right hon. Gentleman thought he was only excluding elementary schools—he personally thought he was wrong in excluding elementary schools—but as a matter of fact he was excluding a very great number beyond. The right hon. Gentleman knew that the teachers who came together to meet the military experts of the War Office only two months ago were not teachers in elementary schools, but in those humbler classes of the middle class secondary schools where the cadet corps chiefly arose. It was these teachers whose hopes the right hon. Gentleman had raised, and which he had now cast down, and he had no doubt that he had in the War Office documentary evidence in regard to the expectations and hopes which were raised, and the disappointment afterwards caused. The Opposition would support the Amendment, weakened as it was through the Government having abandoned the stronger position they occupied before. They would go into the division lobby with the the Government, but they owed no thanks to the right hon Gentleman. They believed he had done what he would repent of hereafter; that he had struck a blow at that scheme of a nation in arms which he had at heart, in making this surrender to the extreme section of his Party.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme) said he was not particularly interested in the military opinions on this matter, nor in the educational opinions on it, as they depended largely on what the cadet corps did and what their actual drills were. But he was interested in what they did with their own children. They allowed their own children to join these cadet corps, and they enjoyed it very much. They liked all that sort of play and half drill which went on; but he could not understand why hon. Members opposite should suggest what they should prevent the children of other classes doing the same sort of thing.

*SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) said there was a broad principle between the hon. Member for Leicester and the Opposition. He did not believe in cadet corps in schools or in military training, whilst they on that side of the House, and many Members on the other side of the House, did believe in them. But they entirely agreed with him on this, that if this principle of cadet corps in schools were carried out, the money should be obtained from public funds, and not out of private individuals. The hon. Member for Leicester would correct him if he misunderstood him in stating that experience had shown that the drill of the cadet corps deteriorated the children; but he thought he was wrong. The hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool would bear him out when he said that the experience of Switzerland was entirely different, and that recently in the schools there they had introduced an absolutely compulsory form of military training. He might point out to the hon. Member for Leicester that a new development had recently taken place in the physical training of our own soldiers. In the old days, and until a short time ago, they were trained in one manner——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (MR. CALDWELL) said that the question before the House was limited to the consideration of the Lords' Amendment as to whether payment should be made "out of money voted by Parliament."

*SIR SAMUEL SCOTT, on a point of order, submitted that the question of training had been brought up by the hon. Member for Leicester.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (MR. CALDWELL) said it had no doubt been mentioned incidentally, but the Amendment before the House did not raise the wider question of the merits or demerits of cadet drill involved in the clause, but only the matter of by whom a certain payment should be made.

*SIR SAMUEL SCOTT submitted, with all deference, that it covered the whole question of the cadet corps. He was trying to reply to an assertion made by the hon. Member for Leicester, that the training had a derogatory effect on the children. He submitted that he was in order in so doing.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he entirely agreed with the Chairman that this Amendment did not cover the whole question of cadet corps to the full extent, but every speaker up to the present time, he thought, had raised the question of the cadet corps. They were dealing with an Amendment which involved expenditure on cadet corps, and therefore cadet corps could incidentally be referred to by speakers.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (MR. CALDWELL) said that there was no objection to an incidental reference to cadet corps, but it would be going outside of the particular Amendment to discuss the general question of the merits or demerits of military drill, or to compare the present with the past physical training of our own soldiers.

*SIR SAMUEL SCOTT said all that he was trying to do was to point out to the hon. Member for Leicester that it was a question of the manner in which the cadet corps or soldiers were trained, and they were not necessarily bound by hard and fast rules to a certain drill. There were different drills which had been perfected lately, and it was therefore possible, in reference to what had been mentioned as to the drill of children, that they might find some drill of a kind which would give them great benefit.

*MR. MADDISON (Burnley) said his hon. friend the Member for Staffordshire had talked about an unholy alliance. He would venture to remark to the hon. Member for Salford that he did not frequently address the House, and that he, who was supposed to be an exponent of free speech, should not interrupt him. Why he rose was because the hon. Member for Leicester had set out to recite the history of certain negotiations and constantly used the plural. The hon. Member even went so far as to say that there were two sorts of Parties who negotiated, and that one had gone behind the back of the other. The fact was there was a number of hon. Members on that side of the House with whom he acted who from the first took a keen interest in the question of cadet corps as it appeared in the Bill.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) asked if the hon. Member was in order and whether he must not confine himself to the expenditure mentioned in the Bill.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (MR. CALDWELL) said the hon. Member must know that a certain amount of latitude had just been claimed by his own side.

*Mr. MADDISON said that in the negotiations to which he had referred the hon. Member for Leicester did not appear at all and therefore could hardly know what really went on. He simply wanted in a word to say that while altogether and entirely agreeing with the hon Member for Leicester in his dislike of those cadet corps so long as they were associated in the Bill with public schools, it was impossible for him honourably to vote against the Amendment. When they first approached the Secretary of State for War in respect to the Amendment of which that was the outcome, they came to a certain arrangement which appeared in the Bill. When that arrangement was upset by the House of Lords the same people were asked by the Secretary of State to meet him again, and it was at that meeting that the words "public money" were suggested. What appeared in the Bill that night was what the Minister for War offered them and what they accepted. He felt bound, having regard to what had taken place, to keep what he considered to be a pledge. A pledge was none the less binding if the bargain which it represented did not happen to be as good as they wished. He was surprised that the hon. Member for Leicester, in his desire to oppose the Lords' Amendments, should say that if these cadet corps had to be there should be public money voted for them. He ventured to say that in that opinion the hon. Member would not carry with him the majority of those who agreed with him that military training of the young was bad and pernicious. He was surprised that the hon. Member was prepared to be so free with public money, for he and his friends had opposed the Cromer Grant on the ground that public money was so precious, that there were so many poor people, and that they ought to be so careful. But the hon. Member for Leicester was prepared to vote public money for causes he objected to altogether. Without this Bill there was nothing to prevent private subscriptions being devoted to cadet corps. The Bill did not alter the situation as to class distinction, but the class distinction was in favour of the working classes. Practically speaking, as the Bill stood the working classes would be immune from the blight of militarism. He deeply regretted that the War Minister had touched the unholy thing at all in his Bill, and, as a matter of fact, he could have got what he wanted without introducing it into the Bill. However, it had been a compromise from the first, and they must make the best of it. He was unable to vote against the Amendment on account of the compact with the War Minister, and he believed that by voting for it they would at least prevent public money being spent on the schools to which the children of the working classes went.

*Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said he wished to say a word on that matter, for it was only right that they should make the situation perfectly clear. It was true they had no part in the negotiations, but they knew that they were going on, and that acceptance of the original compromise caused them not to press their objections. He understood when the Amendment which was negotiated in the first instance was accepted they were expected to withdraw their opposition to the clause. A change had now been made that power should be given to establish cadet corps, provided no financial assistance was given, in certain schools. Under that Amendment, made in another place, they could give it provided it was not out of Parliamentary grants. Anybody could get behind that, and the only safeguard they had now was the President of the Board of Education. They were putting power into the hands of the County Associations, and when there was a President of the Board of Education who had no sympathy with them the thing could be done by a stroke of the pen. They could not have any financial assistance from the County Associations, but they could have an arrangement between the persons finding the money and the Board of Education. In reply to the hon. Member who talked about losing the Bill, he wished to say that he had been too long in that House for that argument to weigh with him. The Bill would not be lost if the Government refused the Amendment. The hon. Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme had asked, had they the right to refuse the working man the opportunity of having his children trained. Surely when the working men who sat in that House got up and applied for it it would be plenty of time to give it them. Did the hon. Member want his children to have it? He certainly would not have any of his children trained to be soldiers. That was not only his own feeling, but the feeling of many Members of the House, and of thousands of working men outside, who did not believe in that Army policy. They would vote against the Amendment.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said he had listened with great interest to the speech of the Member for Leicester. Whatever views they might hold on that side of the House as to the line he advocated, no one could doubt the sincerity and the straightforwardness which characterised his remarks. They had now heard the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues make a good many speeches on this subject of rifle-shooting and cadet corps. He did not know if the hon. Gentleman imagined that the granting of this money to cadet corps would encourage conscription. Had the hon. Gentleman's attention been called to the statement of the Secretary of State that there was unrest in the public mind, and that if it were not allayed matters would tend in that direction? The hon. Member for Leicester had given it as his reason for voting against the Amendment that military and educational expert opinion was against it. He tried to follow the hon. Gentleman's line as to military opinion being against it. So far as he understood, the hon. Gentleman said that military opinion was against cadet corps because boys were being drilled to be soldiers and the military spirit would not thereby be encouraged. The hon. Gentleman went on to speak of educational opinion being against these corps. When asked to give some evidence of what this educational opinion was he was unable to do so. Throughout his speech, at least that part of it which dealt with cadet corps, he dealt with them in the abstract, and confusion remained in their minds as to what the hon. Gentleman meant. A much more damaging thing was the charge he made against the Secretary of State of hunting with the hounds and running with the hare. The right hon. Gentleman looked rather less complacent than usual during his remarks on that subject. Personally, he thought there were overwhelming reasons why money should be given out of public funds to these corps, and he was bound to say it would have been much more straightforwaad if that course had been taken by the right hon. Gentleman. The debate had been, as he said, of much interest, not only because of the subject, but also because it showed the trouble the Government were constantly making for themselves by the chronic state of fear which induced them, whenever they put forward an opinion, to drop it if requested to do so by the noisiest section of the House.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

The House divided: Ayes, 152; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 351.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S
Cleland, J. W.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duckworth, James
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace

Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'd.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hunt, Rowland
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lough, Thomas
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt.Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomson, W.Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E. R.
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Alden, Percy
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barnes, G. N.
Bennett, E. N.
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Byles, William Pollard
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cooper, G. J.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Everett, R. Lacey
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Hayden, John Patrick
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kilbride, Denis
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
M'Callum, John M.
Nicholls, George
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pollard, Dr.
Radford, G. H.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Simon, John Allsebrook
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Arthur Henderson and Mr. George Roberts.

Subsequent Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In line 20, after 'locally' to insert the words 'such requirements where practicable to be embodied in regulations which shall be issued to County Associations from time to time, and on the first occasion not later than the first day of January one thousand nine hundred and nine'"—

read a second time.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE said that in the case of this Amendment what he had to complain of was not bad grammar, but unintelligibility. He would appeal to any hon. Member to say whether, after reading the Amendment, he was not totally unable to grasp its meaning. The Amendment brought out the general want of intelligibility in the clause more. Clause II. hung entirely on Subsection 2 which dealt with the powers assigned by the Army Council to the County Associations. These were arranged in the most extraordinary fashion, and they contained the most extraordinary variety of subjects. The Amendment on which he was speaking brought out, as he had said, the absurdity of the whole drafting of the clause. One of the subjects on which the powers and duties of the Secretary of State were to be transferred was the supply of the requirements on mobilisation of the units of the Territorial Force within the county, in so far as those requirements were directed by the Army Council to be met locally. Then came the whole of the Lords' Amendment which they were now considering, namely, that such requirements where practicable were to be embodied in regulations which should be issued to County Associations from time to time, and on the first occasion not later than the first day of June, 1909. He asked any Member to read the clause for himself and then to say whether the Amendment was of the least importance. It appeared to be couched in terms which showed a misapprehension of the whole meaning of the first part of the clause.

MR. HALDANE said that the subsection merely provided that the supply of requirements on mobilisation should be one of the things which was to be dealt with by the County Association. The Amendment which followed, and which was, he thought, on the whole an improvement to the clause, provided that the requirements were to be stated in regulations, and these regulations were to be published from time to time to the County Associations.

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Lords' Amendment—

"In line 31, after the word 'reservists,' to insert the words 'and a Special Reservist may be re-engaged, and when re-engaged shall continue, subject to the terms of service applicable to Special Reservists.'"—Read a second time.

SIR CHARLES DILKE said that though this Amendment was not ridiculous, as some of the Amendments were, the wording was not very clear. He supposed it was a Government Amendment.

MR. HALDANE said that the words had been put in to make the clause clear. The draughtsman advised the Amendment.

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

Lords' Amendment:—

"In line 33 at the beginning of the clause to insert:—'(1) Every Order in Council or scheme required by this Act to be made before each House of Parliament shall be so laid before forty days next after it is made, if Parliament is then sitting, or if not, within forty days after the commencement of the then next ensuing session; and, if an Address is presented to His Majesty by either House of Parliament within the next subsequent forty days, praying that any such order or scheme may be annulled, His Majesty may thereupon by order in Council annul the same, and the order or scheme so annulled shall thenceforth become void and of no effect, but without prejudice to the validity of any proceedings which may in the meantime have been taken under the same'."—Read a second time.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that when this matter was under discussion in the House of Commons several attempts were made to obtain the effective control of the House over the provisions which these words gave to both Houses of Parliament. Those attempts on the part of Members of the House of Commons were continually resisted from the Treasury Bench, and the House was not given that control for which they asked. The result of this Amendment was that they were giving to the House of Lords for the first time a voice in many military matters which it had never previously possessed. During the debate on the question, the right hon. Member for Dover said that the

Constitution of this country gave almost unlimited powers for dealing with the Army to the House of Commons, and excluded the House of Lords. There were in his own opinion none of the provisions of this Bill which could not have been effected by votes of Parliament and by Treasury Minutes. For the first time, however, all that they were providing for in this Bill was made the subject of the assent of the House of Lords. They had received on the one hand the control of the House of Commons by those words—which were refused to them when they asked for their insertion—but that control was accompanied by a kind of control of the other House, which was now introduced for the first time.

MR. HALDANE said the most careful consideration had been given to the framing of this and similar clauses. All that this clause provided was that the schemes and orders were to be laid on the Tables of both Houses of Parliament, and either House might move an Address. It was then in the power of the King, if advised by his Ministers so to do, to annul the scheme. Obviously if the House of Commons carried such a Resolution the Ministers would advise the King.

Lords' Amendment agreed to.

Subsequent Lords' Amendments agreed to.

SHERIFFS COURTS (SCOTLAND) [REMUNERATION.]

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of the remuneration of any interim sheriff-substitute appointed in pursuance of any Act of the present session to regulate and amend the laws and practice relating to the civil procedure in Sheriff Courts in Scotland."

Resolution agreed to.

SALMON AND FRESHWATER FISHERIES BILL [LORDS.]

Read a second time. Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for tomorrow (Wednesday.)—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

As amended (in the Standing Committee and on re-committal), considered; read the third time, and passed.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1905-6.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

I. Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - -	455,264	18	4
Total Deficits - -	217,505	19	2
Net Surplus -	£237,758	19	2

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

1. Resolved, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1905-6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
1	Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines	—			163,909	1	8
2	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy	18,072	14	10	—		
3	Medical Establishments and Services	12,042	10	4	—		
4	Martial Law	720	19	6	—		
5	Educational Services	10,824	8	0	—		
6	Scientific Services	—			3,782	10	4
7	Royal Naval Reserves	35,539	13	0	—		
8	Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c.:						
	I. Personnel	63,015	9	2	—		
	II. Matériel	11,824	16	1	—		
	III. Contract Work	46,417	6	4	—		
9	Naval Armaments	127,868	17	7	—		
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad	106,664	13	1	—		
11	Miscellaneous Effective Services	17,471	4	2	—		
12	Admiralty Office	—			5,800	14	1
13	Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay	—			31,897	17	8
14	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances	4,802	6	3	—		
15	Civil Pensions and Gratuities	—			9,550	10	4
—	Amount written off as irrecoverable	—			2,565	5	1
	Total	455,264	18	4	217,505	19	2
	Net Surplus	£237,758 19 2					

II. Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ending 31st March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz :—

	£	*s.*	*d.*
Total Surpluses	1,396,005	1	10
Total Deficits	61,868	4	0
Net Surplus	£1,334,136	17	10

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

2. Resolved, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Army Services, 1905–6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
1	Pay, &c., of Army - - - - - -	256,166	18	10	—		
2	Medical Establishment: Pay, &c. - -	25,504	11	11	—		
3	Militia: Pay, Bounty, &c. - - - -	66,162	14	8	—		
4	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances	40,604	8	11	—		
5	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances -	—			613	19	1
6	Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts -	187,279	4	7	—		
7	Supplies and Clothing - - - - -	415,222	14	10	—		
8	Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - - - - - -	122,089	1	7	—		
9	Armaments and Engineer Stores - -	100,865	18	11	—		
10	Works and Buildings - - - - -	155,563	4	9	—		
11	Establishments for Military Education -	7,038	12	2	—		
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	7,910	10	0	—		
13	War Office and Army Accounts Department - - - - - - - -	—			3,936	14	1
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, &c. -	11,597	0	8	—		
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, &c. - -	—			41,452	12	3
16	Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, & Gratuities	—			6,428	3	9
—	Balances irrecoverable - - - -	—			9,436	14	10
	Total - - -	1,396,005	1	10	61,868	4	0
	Net Surplus -	£1,334,136	17	10			

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he might remind the House that this appeared for the first time in a new form, and he thought the House should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it at a more convenient time. He hoped, therefore, the Government would see their way to put down the Report Stage for a more convenient time.

MR. WHITELEY: It must be taken to-day.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH asked if the hon. Gentleman would put it down as the first order in Supply.

MR. ASQUITH: Could it not be discussed on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: It could.

MR. ASQUITH: That would be a more convenient time.

Questions put, and agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow (Wednesday.)

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of this instant July, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 31st July, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Coventry Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Tees Conservancy Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. Moved, That the Order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection in regard to the Bradford (Yorks) Order.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill—(Bradford (Yorks) Order) —(opposed). Report from the Committee of Selection, "That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill so far as it relates to Bradford (Yorks) Order; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Order to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Order.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3878. Brazil; No. 3879. Spain (Canary Islands).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT, 1906.

The Public Trustee Rules, 1907; Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 143.)

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, this is an unopposed Bill which has come up from the House of Commons, and may be cited as the Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1907. It extends the present law, and provides that all the provisions of Section 12 of the Petty Sessions Clerk (Ireland) Act, 1858, and of any enactment amending the same, with reference to the gratuities or pensions which may be given to petty sessions clerks retiring from office through age or infirmity, shall apply to the recognised assistants of the clerks of petty sessions at Cork and Belfast appointed or hereafter to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of Section 10 of the said Act. There are only two of these assistants at Cork and nine at Belfast. It has been felt for a very considerable time by the magistrates of Belfast that these assistants have laboured under a very grave injustice by reason of the fact that they were not entitled to pensions. The contributions from Belfast to the Petty Sessions Clerks Fund, from which the salaries and pensions are payable, is more than sufficient to meet any possible claims that might arise for pensions under the Bill. The power of making rules conferred on the Lord-Lieutenant by Section 29 of the Act of 1858 is by this Bill extended to the making of rules respecting the qualifications, salaries, and appointment of any such assistants hereafter to be appointed and respecting the removal of any such assistants, whether existing or hereafter to be appointed. But there will be no necessity to fall back on that provision in Belfast, as the fund derived from fines, penalties, etc., there is adequate for the purpose. With regard to Cork, where, as I have said, there are only two assistants of clerks of petty sessions, there is no doubt the fund is large enough to cover this matter. Strong representations have been made in favour of the Bill, and I hope your Lordships will see no objection to granting it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Mayo.*)

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, after the clear and lucid explanation which has been given of the details of this Bill by the noble mover, there is nothing for me to add, except to say that it was amended in certain particulars in the other House to meet the views of the Government, and that in its present form the Government of Ireland have no objection to the Bill, and will be glad to see it passed into law.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I quite anticipated the statement which has just been made on behalf of the Irish Office. This is, no doubt, a meritorious Bill, and I think it is only right that provision should be made for the assistants of the clerks of petty sessions at Cork and Belfast. But a question might possibly arise as to the word "recognised." The Bill provides that the section of the Act of 1858 shall apply to the "recognised assistants" of the petty sessions clerks. If the Government are satisfied that no difficulty or uncertainty is likely to arise through the use of that term I will not press the point, though I think the phrase needs some definition. The power of making rules which is given to the Lord-Lieutenant only applies to assistants hereafter to be appointed and to the removal of existing assistants, but nothing is said of his power of deciding who is a "recognised assistant." But probably the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office will consult with the draftsmen in his Department on the point.

THE EARL OF MAYO: Though the term may not be a legal one, I cannot conceive that there will be any difficulty in deciding who is a recognised assistant.

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow

---

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, this Bill introduces certain Amendments into the Public Health (Scotland) Act of 1897. The effect of those Amendments is slightly to relax some of the provisions of that Act, and to make them more elastic in their action. These provisions are contained in three consecutive sections of the Act —Section 57, which lays down the form of certificate which must accompany any child which has either had an infectious disease or has been exposed to the risk of infection, on its return to school; Section 58, which prohibits any person suffering from an infectious disease from carrying on any trade or business in regard to food or from milking any animal; and Section 59, which prohibits any person suffering from infectious disease from entering any public conveyance, or train, or ship. Those clauses have been found to be unduly restrictive in the case of the milder infectious diseases. There is no doubt that they would be absolutely intolerable if they were to be applied to consumption; and it is believed that it is this fact which has prevented the local authorities from including consumption in the list of notifiable diseases, though on other grounds they are fully aware of the desirability of doing so. When the Act was passed consumption was not generally recognised as being of a highly infectious nature, and therefore the Act was not drawn up with any idea that consumption would be included under its provisions; but the march of medical science is so rapid in these days that even in ten years a great change has taken place, and the great bulk of medical opinion is now in favour of that being done. There is no need to have any special legislation for that object, because, though under the Notification of Infectious Diseases Act twelve diseases are specified which shall be notified, local authorities are given power to add other diseases to that number if they consider it desirable to do so, always with the consent of the Local Government Board; and, as I have already said, it is believed that the harshness and inelasticity of these provisions constitute one of the principal factors in preventing this from being done. A very interesting circular was issued last March by the Scottish Local Government Board to local authorities, calling attention to the duties of those authorities to take steps to prevent the spread of consumption. That circular shows how the patients themselves and their friends may be educated, both as to the precautions against the spreading of the disease and also as to the curative value of such simple things as fresh air and open windows. It goes on to show how small open-air sanatoria may be erected at very trifling cost, and it concludes by stating that notification by itself is useless and that the Board will not sanction its being applied unless it is at the same time accompanied by some measures of a curative nature. As to the actual amendments of the Public Health Act contained in this Bill, it may be broadly said that they consist in substituting for absolute prohibition such words as—

> "Provided that adequate precautions have been taken against spreading such disease or infection,"

thus leaving to the medical officer of health a certain discretion as to what those adequate precautions shall be. For instance, a child living in a house where there had recently been a case of small-pox or scarlet fever would, of course, not be allowed to return to school any more than it is at present, but that prohibition would not be necessary in the case of a child living in a house where there was a case of consumption, at all events except in a very acute stage of that disease. I hope I have said sufficient to indicate the character and the objects of this Bill. It is a very modest measure, but it is hoped that it may have a very far-reaching effect in stopping the spread of the most deadly and most prevalent disease in Scotland.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I rise to give a very cordial welcome to the provisions contained in this Bill, and I do not think, after the really lucid explanation which the noble Lord opposite has given, it is necessary for me to say very much. But the case is even stronger in one respect than the noble Lord stated. As he told your Lordships, the object of this Bill is to bring three clauses of the Public Health Act, 1897, into harmony with other sections and with what really is the existing practice. Take Section 57 of that Act, which is known as the School Attendance Clause. In practice it is quite clear to me that, as interpreted, the section is much too stringent, and is far more stringent than was really intended when Parliament passed it. It provides that no child from an infected house shall do certain things—amongst others, go to school. It takes no account whatever of whether the child has been exposed to any infection. The child may have been isolated; the house may have been a large one, and it may have been even a workhouse. In Scotland we have the sensible practice, if there are children in the workhouse, which is not often, of sending them to the ordinary public school. If there had been a case of infectious disease—it might only be measles or whooping cough—at one end of the building, the child being at the other end and never having been in contact, the clause has been held to preclude that child from attending school. It is obviously of advantage that discretion should be given to the local authority and the medical officer, and if the medical officer certifies that there is no danger in the child's attending school it is better that it should go to school. Take another case. No child from an infected house shall pick fruit, and so on. It is perfectly right, if the operation which is prohibited is the milking of a cow, that nobody from a house in which there is an infectious disease should deal with milk, milk being known to be one of the most prevalent means by which infectious diseases of certain kinds can be carried. But it is absurd, if there is a case of whooping cough in a house, that a child from that house is not to be allowed for example, to pick fruit for sale; and the effect of the extreme stringency of these three clauses of the Public Heath Act of 1897 is, that they act as a restraint upon local authorities adding certain diseases to the list of those that are notifiable. It is obviously of importance that diseases like measles and whooping cough, which are not, I think, on the compulsory list, and consumption, or phthisis as it is more scientifically called, should be made notifiable; but if, by making them notifiable, you by necessity carry with it all these restraints which I have indicated, you put a very great handicap and difficulty in the way of an intelligent local authority and medical officer working the Acts in a sensible and reasonable spirit. I am able to say, from a knowledge of what has been going on in Scotland, that public opinion is really ripe for this change. Certain of the principal local authorities have already taken considerable steps in the direction desired by setting apart hospitals and beds in hospitals for such dieases as consumption. The city of Edinburgh has done so, Glasgow is contemplating doing so, and the large county of Lanark has already taken action in the same direction. I believe local authorities all over Scotland would have gone further but for these clauses, and I believe the passing of this Bill will remove a difficulty out of their way. It is because of the extremely stringent nature of these three clauses, as interpreted, that matters have not gone further than they have. I believe that by the sensible and moderate relaxation which is proposed in this Bill a valuable power will be put into the hands of local authorities, and so far as I am concerned I venture respectfully to give the Bill my very cordial support.

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

COMPANIES (DEBENTURES AND DEBENTURE STOCK) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

TELEGRAPH (MONEY) BILL.

Read 3ª (according to order) and passed.

FINANCE BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Wednesday next; [The Lord Privy Seal (*M. Ripon*)] (No. 144.)

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 145.)

House adjourned at five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 31*st July*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Ordered, That in case of the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords], Standing Order 211 be suspended, and that the Committee of Selection have leave to appoint the Committee on the Bill to sit and proceed forthwith.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Ordered, That the Committee on Group K of Private Bills have leave to sit on Saturday next, notwithstanding any Adjournment of the House.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.

Petitions for protection of the Native Races; From Kingston upon Hull; and Nelson; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION SCOTLAND BILL.

Petition from Shettlestone, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Castle Douglas, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Ross and Cromarty, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Petition from Cardiff, against Lords, Amendments to Clause 2 (f); to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS (IRELAND).

Return [presented 29th July] to be printed. [No. 280.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3878 to 3883 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 663 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th May; *Mr. Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 281.]

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Trustee Rules, 1907 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 282.]

MANUFACTURED GOODS, EXPORTED AND IMPORTED (UNITED KINGDOM AND GERMANY), 1882-1906.

Return ordered, "showing the value of the Exports, Imports, and excess of Exports of Manufactured Goods (according to the classification adopted in each of the two Countries) in the cases of the United Kingdom and Germany, respectively, in each of the years since 1882, with averages for each quinquennial period; showing also the estimated value of the Exports, Imports, and excess of Imports of Manufactured Goods in the case of Germany, in each of the last five years, based on the classification adopted in the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Bonar Law.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Home Office Contracts.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire W.R., Elland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any alterations have been made in the conditions inserted in notices and contracts by the Home Office since the Return given in Parliamentary Paper, No. 277, of Session 1906, pages 128–129, Appendix No. 1 C.D.; and, if so, what the alterations are.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) As regards Return C (Prison Department), no alteration has up to the present time been made. As regards Return D (Metropolitan Police), the following alterations have been made, viz.: No. 1.—Building contract. The contractors are now required to exhibit at their workshops, etc., a copy of an extract from the Resolution of the House of Commons of 13th February, 1891, with regard to workmen's wages. The wages are not now specified in building contracts, but it is stipulated that current wages are to be paid. No. 2.—The repairs contract stipulates that the above notice be exhibited, and a minimum table of wages has to be quoted. No. 5.—The boot contract no longer exists, a money allowance having been sanctioned in lieu of boots as from

October, 1897. No. 8.—The new clothing contract stipulates for the exhibition of the above-quoted notice, also that the current wages for competent workers be paid. The receiver has power, instead of imposing penalty, to determine the contract if work is not done in the contractor's own factory, and if the current scale of wages is not paid. The penalty in the helmet contract has been reduced to £50, but the clause for determination of contract has been added, and a stipulation inserted that the copy of the Resolution above referred to be exhibited. No. 14. Clocks; No. 15. Candles and soap; No. 16. Forage; No. 20. Coals and coke; No. 21. Sale of old clothing.—Power is now reserved to the receiver of determining the contract if the contractor shall fail to pay such wages as are generally accepted as current for competent workpeople. I may add that it has been decided to insert in the prison clothing contract a clause prohibiting home work, as in the police clothing contract.

Payment of Wiremen in Birmingham Telegraph Office.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that two men, employed as wiremen at the Birmingham Post Office, are, or were, engaged making frames, doors, and screens, and that they were being paid from 2s. 3d. to 2s. 6d. per day less than the current rate of wages paid in this district for doing this class of work; and whether he will take steps to put a stop to this system of doing work in connection with his Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I find that a local official, acting without instructions and contrary to rules, employed two wiremen to fit up a rough frame door and screen for the advantage of the men employed behind the switch sections in the trunk telephone exchange at the Birmingham Post Office. I have taken steps to prevent a recurrence of the irregularity.

Revenue from Licences for Dealing in Manufacturered Silver.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what was the average amount of revenue acquired from the licences imposed on dealers in manufactured silver during the past five financial years.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The average amount of revenue derived from licences to deal in gold and silver plate for the five years to 31st March, 1907, was £65,391. Licences to "deal in manufactured silver" are not distinguished from general plate licences.

Annuity to Heirs of Lord Rodney, Duke of Schomberg and Earl Nelson.

MR LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the Acts 23 Geo. 3, c. 86, and 33 Geo. 3, c. 77, whereby an annuity of £2,000 has been conferred on all and every the heirs to whom the title of Lord Rodney shall descend; whether he is aware that to date the nation has paid seven holders of this title £248,000; and whether he can promise that the Government will bring in a Bill to end this annuity.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) In 1890 terms were agreed between the Treasury and Lord Rodney for the commutation of this pension. The sum proposed to be paid was approximately twenty-seven years purchase, that being the hightest rate which the Treasury felt justified in allowing, in view of the opinion expressed by a Select Committee of this House in 1887. The agreement was duly submitted to the Court of Chancery, but the Court refused its consent on the ground that the arrangement was not sufficiently beneficial to the persons interested in the remainder. The commutation could not, therefore, be effected. The public faith has been pledged by Parliament to the payment of this pension, and I do not think that Parliament would be likely to entertain proposals for its termination otherwise than on equitable terms.

MR. LEA: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the letters patent dated 22nd December, 8 Will. 3, to the letters patent dated 29th June, 1715, and Acts 1 Geo. 1, No. 78, and 19 and 20 Vic., c. 59, whereby a pension of £2,880 net was conferred on the heirs of the Duke of Schomberg; whether he is aware that this pension has been reduced by commutations in 1855, 1876, 1877, and 1883, until at the present time £720 still continues to be paid to the heirs of this individual; will he state the amount to date that has been paid by the public to the heirs under these letters patent and Acts, including the capital amounts paid under the commutations dated above, and the names of those heirs to-day to whom the £720 is paid, specifying the amounts paid to each; and whether he will give this House an assurance that he will introduce a short Bill next session to end this annuity.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The sums paid for commutation of the portions of this pension which have been redeemed were—

	£	s.	d.
In 1855 . .	19,399	8	0
In 1877 . .	29,100	12	0
In 1877 . .	2,586	14	4
In 1883 . .	7,113	8	8
Total .	58,200	3	0

To calculate the total sum that has been paid in respect of this pension during the last 200 years would require a great deal of research, even if complete records are in existence, which is more than doubtful. Of the annual sum of £720 which remains payable, one moiety is paid to the trustees of the will of the late H. P. Powys and the other moiety to Mr. R. Gosling. These recipients have never been willing to accept commutation on such terms as the Treasury has been able to offer, namely a sum approximately equal to twenty-seven years purchase. I cannot undertake to introduce a Bill next session to make acceptance compulsory.

MR. LEA: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the Act 46 Geo. 3, c. 146, whereby an annuity of £5,000 has been conferred on such persons to whom the title of Earl Nelson shall descend; that this annuity was in addition to a sum of £120,000 as a further provision for the family of the said Earl Nelson; whether he is aware that under this Act the nation has paid the Nelson family £625,000 to date; and whether he can give an assurance that next year this Government will bring in a short Bill to end this annuity.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The particulars of this pension (and of the others referred to in the two previous questions) are shown at page 45 of the published Finance Accounts. The sums paid under the Act of 46 Geo. 3, in addition to the pension, amounted, I understand, to £110,000. The circumstances in regard to the possibility of determining this pension are the same as in the case of Lord Rodney.

Lighting of the Natural History Museum.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will consider the desirability of introducing electric light, or some other form of lighting, into the Natural History Museum, South Kensington, seeing that it is maintained at the expense of the nation, and that at present the valuable collection contained there is closed to the public on the numerous dark days incidental to the climatic conditions of London.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) This work is being gradually proceeded with, and an instalment of the provision is taken in this year's Estimates (Class 1, page 24).

Irish Junior Assistant Mistresses.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if, when a junior assistant mistress with little literary qualification is appointed to a national school, and is the only help the principal teacher has, he can say how the notes to teachers are to be carried out which state that the junior classes should be taught by an experienced teacher; and what the work of such a junior assistant is to be.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that no general answer can be given to a hypothetical question such as this. If the circumstances of any particular case should be submitted to the Commissioners they will give the matter careful consideration.

Refusal of Increment to Head Teacher of Shrove National School.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the assistant teacher of Shrove National School, Roll No. 3,470, was granted an increment dating from April, 1906, he can state why the principal of the same school was refused an increment.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the Commissioners of National Education that the principal teacher referred to is in receipt of a salary in excess of the maximum salary of his grade. He is therefore ineligible to receive a further increment in that grade. His claim to promotion to the second grade is at present under consideration, and if it should be granted he will receive an increase of salary as from 1st April last.

Charge against Constable Thomas M'Govern.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any, and if so, what steps have been taken against Constable Thomas M'Govern, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, now stationed at Athenry, county Galway, who on examination at Clonmel Assizes on 8th instant, in a case of alleged embezzlement against Sergeant Kearney, committed perjury in swearing that he knew and identified two women who were alleged to have paid Kearney certain sums of money, the amounts of fishery fines, while Constable M'Govern previously swore at Carrick-on-Suir Petty Sessions, on 28th March last, that he did not know and could not identify the two women, although he saw them in court and heard them giving evidence.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General informs me that there was a slight discrepancy between the evidence given by Constable M'Govern at petty sessions and that subsequently given by him at assizes, but there is no sufficient ground for suggesting that he was guilty of wilful and corrupt perjury. Upon cross-examination at assizes the constable fully explained the reasons for the variation in his evidence. It is not intended to take any action against the constable.

Application for Re-instatement of Thomas Bullman.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have received any application for reinstatement in the farm of Ballyodock, on the estate of Mrs. Sarah Hyde, Ballindangan, county Cork, from which farm Thomas Bullman was evicted about fourteen years ago; and, if an application has been made, who is the person claiming to represent the evicted tenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement in a farm comprising about eighty-three acres, situate at Ballinacaragh on the estate referred to, from William Bullman, who claims to have been the tenant at the date of the eviction.

Pay of Examiners in the Exchequer and Audit Department.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the new examiners in the Exchequer and Audit Department are allowed £120 per annum when they become established after two years' service; and, if so, will he explain why ex-Second Division clerks, doing precisely the same kind of work and who are now acting examiners, receive only £115 per annum after eight years' service, when they become similarly established as examiner.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Officers newly appointed to the Exchequer and Audit Department and to similar posts under the Admiralty and War Office receive £100 a year and £120 after two years' probation. Second Division clerks on promotion to the new establishment, after eight years' service, enter the scale at the rate of pay which they have reached as Second Division clerks, viz., £115, with annual increments of £10, making their salary £135 after two years as examiners.

Transfer of Irish Audit Work from London to Dublin.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, shortly before the present Government came into office, it was contemplated by the late Government to transfer the Irish audit work from London to Dublin; and, if so, will he explain why such transfer is not now carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am not aware that any such step was contemplated.

Irish Audit Office.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the late Comptroller and Auditor-General was in favour of having the Irish audit work transferred and done in Dublin instead of in London, as at present; whether such transfer has been opposed by the present Assistant Comptroller and Auditor, who refused to receive a report favourable to it from a principal clerk who was sent to Dublin and instructed to investigate its feasibility; and will he say how long this Assistant Comptroller has been in the Audit Office, and what were his qualifications for the post he now holds.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The reply is in the negative.

Burwell Crown Farm.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether any sum, and, if so, what amount, was paid to the outgoing tenant of the Crown farm at Burwell for unexhausted improvements or compensation for disturbance.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Crown Farm at Burwell had been in hand for two years before it was let for small holdings, and there was in consequence no outgoing tenant to compensate. The amount of the valuation due from the incoming tenant was £2,205 6s. 7d., and this sum has been apportioned among the sub-tenants of my hon. friend the Member for Newmarket, with the exception of £175 9s. representing the valuation for certain fixtures on which my hon. friend is paying interest.

Mile End Guardians Bread Contracts.

MR. HEDGES (Kent, Tonbridge): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been drawn to Mr. Elvey Robb's public statement that the Mile End guardians paid for bread in the course of the years 1904, 1905, and 1906 £1,465 17s. 6d. in excess of the lowest tenders; and whether, in view of this and the other facts elicited, he will extend the inquiry to all the contracts of the guardians during the period which is now under review in regard to the coal contracts.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am aware of the statement referred to. I understand that either to-day or to-morrow the inquiry will be adjourned for some weeks, during which the work charged for in respect of the scattered homes and the infirmary will be measured. Before the inquiry is resumed I will consider the suggestion that it should be extended to other contracts besides those now under investigation.

Manchester Public Carters and the Railway Companies.

SIR MAURICE LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that, as one of the results of the recent combination of interests between the various railway companies, the Midland Railway Company and other companies serving Manchester have given instructions that as from the 1st October, 1907, the allowance made to the chief firms of public carters in Manchester in respect of the collection and forwarding of shipping traffic from Manchester are to be materially reduced; whether he is aware that such action on the part of the railway companies will deprive the public of the benefits of competition and enable the companies to obtain for themselves the uncontrolled monopoly of services outside their terminal stations; and whether the Board of Trade will take steps to prevent the railway companies from adopting this course.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I understand that the regulation of the allowances made to cartage and other agents is one of the objects of the arrangements between the railway companies referred to in the correspondence recently presented to Parliament (Cd. 3420). I shall be glad to consider any particulars of the reductions in the allowances at Manchester which my hon. friend is in a position to supply, but until I have examined them I cannot say whether the Board of Trade could take any useful steps in the matter,

Channel Islands Shipping Laws.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether a conference has taken place between the representatives of

Guernsey and Jersey and the Board of Trade in regard to the Board's memorandum dealing with the proposed assimilation of the shipping laws of the Channel Islands to those of this country; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Yes, Sir; a conference which it is hoped will have useful results has been held, and there was a general agreement amongst the members present that uniformity in the law relating to merchant shipping was desirable on various points. It is hoped that in course of time this agreement may lead to legislation.

Holme Lacy, Hereford, Charity.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether he is aware that in 1839 a sum of £100 per year was left by the Hon. Mrs. Scudamore, of Holme Lacy, Hereford, for the benefit of ten poor decayed men; whether he is aware that one recipient of this charity is a farmer, who farms more than 340 acres of land and holds several public positions, such as district councillor, parish councillor, school manager, and Poor Law guardian; whether this gentleman has received more than £90 from this charity and became a recipient before he was fifty years of age; whether he was a late employee of the trustee who acted in the disbursement of this charity without the aid of other trustees; can he say whether an inquiry has been held; if so, with what result; will he place a full Report of such inquiry upon the Table of the House; and what steps have the Commissioners taken to compel the return of all moneys received by persons who cannot be described as decayed and who have received this charity in a very doubtful manner.

(*Answered by Mr. Trevelyan.*) The Hon. Mrs. Scudamore's charity was settled by the Court of Chancery in 1704, under the will dated 29th August, 1699, of Mrs. Jane Scudamore, for ten poor decayed men, to be appointed by Viscount Scudamore and his heirs. An inquiry was held into this charity on 4th July. In the course of the inquiry the farmer referred to in the Question resigned his claim to the funds of the charity. The person acting in the administration of the trust, who has hitherto exercised the sole patronage of the charity under the will, has now applied for a scheme for the appointment of trustees who will share in the distribution of the charity. A report on the case has not yet been made to the Commissioners by the Assistant Commissioner who held the inquiry. Such reports are confidential. A full report of what took place at the inquiry was published in the local newspapers. The matter is now under the consideration of the Commissioners, and there is no reason to anticipate that the error complained of in the Question will be possible in the future under the new scheme.

Carnarvon Estate Duties.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state on what number of estates of persons residing at death in the county of Carnarvon estate duty has been paid during the years 1901–6; what was the average net value of such estates; and what number of the estates which came under review were sworn under £100, £300, £500, £1,000, and £10,000 respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) This information cannot be given, as the records of estates are not kept under a classification with reference to place of death.

Indian Income-tax.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the improved condition of the finances in India since the income-tax was introduced, he will consider the advisability of raising the minimum of taxable income from the present low level of 500 rupees, or £33 per annum, to a figure more closely approximating to that fixed in the much richer community of the United Kingdom, viz., £160, or Rs. 2,400; and whether, in any case, the principle of relief to earned small incomes will be introduced and applied in India as in this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The minimum of taxable income was raised in March, 1903, from Rs.500 (£33) to Rs.1,000 (£66) a year. The maximum rate of tax is much lower than in the United Kingdom, viz., 6d. in the pound, incomes between Rs.1,000 and Rs.2,000 (£66 and £133) are taxed at 5d. in the pound, and incomes derived from agriculture are exempt. There is no intention of introducing further differentiation.

Indian Police Service.

SIR SEYMOUR KING. To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Indian Police Commission, in paragraph 87 of their Report, strongly recommended that the period of compulsory service for pension should be reduced, on the ground that the period of thirty years is too long, and stated that the Government should have power to compel the retirement of any officer after twenty-five years service, and an officer should be entitled to retire after twenty-five years service on full pension, if he desires to do so, basing the recommendation on the nature of police work in India; and whether, seeing that the refusal of the Secretary of State to adopt this recommendation has caused discontent among the members of the service, the whole question will be reconsidered and more favourable terms be granted, having regard to the necessity, in existing circumstances, of maintaining the police service in a high state of efficiency.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The recommendation of the Police Commission to which the hon. Gentleman refers was not accepted by the Government of India. They have informed me that, after a full consideration of the matter, they have decided to propose no alteration in the existing rules. As at present advised I am not inclined to suggest a reconsideration of this question.

Tetanus in the Punjab.

SIR W. J. COLLINS: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he proposes to institute any further inquiry into certain deaths from tetanus in the Punjab consequent on the employment of Dr. Haffkine's prophylactic against plague, or whether he accepts the conclusions of the Jenkins' Commission and of the Lister Institute as final; what action he proposes to take in regard to the further use of Dr. Haffkine's prophylactic, and, if it is to be employed in the future, to which standard will it be required to conform; and whether Dr. Haffkine is to be reinstated or not.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) After giving the case my careful attention I am not prepared to institute another inquiry into a question which has been exhaustively examined by two impartial and independent bodies, and respecting which no conclusion can be arrived at with absolute certainty. The prophylactic continues to be manufactured at the Bombay plague laboratory. As is stated in the Government of India Press Notice, dated 13th December, 1904, the "Standard method" of preparing the fluid has been reverted to, the fluid being sterilised by methods approved by the Indian Plague Commission, and containing the requisite proportion of carbolic acid. The latest report of the laboratory states that inoculation is now extensively employed without any untoward results, and I do not propose to take any action with regard to it. Mr. Haffkine's position was explained in the Answer which I gave to the Question asked by the hon. Member on the 19th March, 1907.† If he elects to return to India he will be employed on research work at a salary equal to that of which he was in receipt when he left India.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Portsmouth Review.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty for how long the gunnery and other training establishments will be closed while the Home Fleet is mobilised for the review at Portsmouth.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): According to custom, the gunnery and other training establishments will be closed for a month for the annual refit of material and leave for the instructional staff.

Sea Lords and the Press.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the nature of the obligation and the rule or rules, if any, which regulate the communication to the public or the Press by the Sea Lords and their subordinates of information regarding the Navy, or of the views of all or any of them upon naval matters.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 644.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: There are no regulations affecting the members of the Board. The conduct of subordinate naval officers is governed by the King's Regulations. There are, of course, the usual obligations of official secrecy.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Have these customary obligations been observed in the case of the First Sea Lord?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That is an invidious Question which I decline to answer.

The Home Fleet.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty why, in view of the official statement that the Home Fleet could be made ready for sea in a few hours, it has been found necessary to inform the dockyards far in advance of the date of the mobilisation.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: His Majesty the King having intimated his gracious intention to inspect the Home Fleet, orders were given as soon as His Majesty's commands were received. This in no way conflicts with the fact that the Home Fleet could be made ready for sea in a few hours.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): Does the right hon. Gentleman consider that an Answer to the Question on the Paper?

[No Answer was returned.]

"Dreadnought" Armaments.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is yet in a position to give the armament of the Japanese battleships "Satsuma" and "Aki," of 19,350 tons and 19,800 tons respectively, which are now building; and whether these battleships, which are the outcome of Japanese experience in the late war, carry armaments which support the departure from accepted practice which we have made in building the "Dreadnought," the distinctive feature of which is an armament exclusively of one type of heavy gun.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am not yet in a position to give any information respecting the armament of these battleships.

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that men are now being discharged from the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, under what is called revision and not reduction, and the men are informed that they are not entitled to the bonus given to men who have served seven years or more on reduction; and will he consider what method can be adopted to enable men discharged on revision to obtain their bonus.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): I am glad that my hon. friend has called attention to this matter. A certain number of men who were taken on on temporary engagement during the pressure of the late war have been gradually discharged. But as the result of consultation with the Quartermaster-General I am glad to say that we think that no further discharges need take place in the Ordnance Department.

MR. CROOKS: But these men are being discharged under what is called a revision instead of a reduction, and therefore get no bonus.

MR. HALDANE: They were men temporarily taken on. I hope there will be no further discharges.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): How far, approximately, would the £50,000 voted to Lord Cromer go in the direction of supplying a bonus to every one of these men?

Duke of York's Military School.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any changes in the organisation of the Duke of York's Royal Military School are in contemplation; whether it is proposed to make any change in the method of conducting the examinations; whether the Army Council has decided that examinations are in future to be conducted by the teachers themselves, or whether external examiners will be employed either in association with the teachers or as independent examiners.

MR. HALDANE: The Army Council, in the matter of examinations, as well as in the general system of instruction in the Duke of York's Royal Military School, are following, as far as practicable, the system in force in the civil schools of this country. In carrying out these changes, officials of the Board of Education have been consulted and have freely given the Council the benefit of their experience and assistance. But I agree with my hon. friend that it would be well to adopt the suggestion that external examiners should be associated with the teachers.

Indian Salt Tax.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will consider the advisability of recommending taxation of the luxuries of the rich in India with a view to the abolition of the salt tax, seeing that salt is a necessary of life in that country.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): As stated by the Secretary of State a day or two ago the subject of the salt tax will continue to receive his closest attention.

MR. HUNT: Was a workman punished for trying to extract a little salt out of the sea?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE asked for notice.

India and the Sugar Convention.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India when it is expected that the representations sent to the Indian Government with regard to the Brussels Convention will be circulated among Members.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: They have been placed in the Library, as promised by the Secretary of State. I think this will meet the requirements of Members desirous of consulting the Papers.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Can they not be circulated in the same way as the Colonial Office Papers were?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I should imagine there will be no difficulty.

Panama Canal Labour.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinsford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies under what conditions labourers from Trinidad are engaged in the construction of the Panama Canal; whether provision has been made for the repatriation of the labourers at the expiration of their contracts at the expense of the importer; whether the labourers are accompanied by their wives and families; and what system of inspection is in force to see that the terms of engagement are fulfilled.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N. W.): I can only refer the hon. Member to the Paper which has been laid and to the Answer which I have already given on this subject on Tuesday last. †

Labour Inspection in the New Hebrides

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when His Majesty's Government expect to receive the Report of the High Commissioner of the Western Pacific on the character of the system of inspection and the number of inspectors required for the inspection of labourers employed by British subjects in the New Hebrides; and whether the Report will be issued to Members.

MR. CHURCHILL: His Majesty's Government doubt whether the High Commissioner's Report can reasonably be expected for some little time yet, as he will no doubt wish to consult the Resident Commissioner for the New Hebrides, between which islands and Fiji communication is slow. The question of publishing the Report will be considered when it is received.

Orange River Colony Revaluation.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether this Government has received, either through the Governor of the Orange River Colony, or through an official of the Settlers' Union of the Orange River Colony, a Petition or Resolution in favour of the revaluation of farms; and, if so, what reply has been made.

---

† See page 762.

MR. CHURCHILL: Various requests for revaluation were received last year from individuals, but nothing of the kind has reached the Secretary of State since the draft legislation for improving the position of settlers to which I referred in my reply to the hon. Member of 23rd July was published. †

Natal's War Contribution.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Natal has asked the Imperial authorities to refund Natal's contribution of £700,000 to the expenses of the late war; whether the Government has waived its claim to the Transvaal's promised war contribution of £30,000,000; and whether Natal has asked for the payment of the sum of £520,000 for rents and harbour dues incurred by the Imperial Government during the war, which were remitted by Natal, although similar charges were paid in neighbouring Colonies.

MR. CHURCHLL: No such request has been received from the Natal Government.

St. Helena Water Tax.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government can see its way to remove the water tax existing in St. Helena, which has a tendency to prevent ships from entering the port for water; will he also state how much revenue was derived during 1906 from this tax.

MR. CHURCHILL: The charge for supplying water to ships at St. Helena has recently been reduced from 5s. to 2s. per ton of water supplied, and it is not considered possible to make any further reduction. The revenue derived from this source for the year 1906 amounted to £44 5s.

Repatriation of Orange River Colony Burghers.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any portion, and, if so, how much, of the guarantee loan of £5,000,000 to the Orange River Colony is to be applied to the repatriation of the burghers and to compensation to burghers.

MR. CHURCHILL: The hon. Member's Question is not understood in the form in which he has placed it on the Paper. No question has arisen of guaranteeing a loan of £5,000,000 to the Orange River Colony.

Mauritius Council.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the protest made by the elected members of the Mauritius Council against the further retention in office of Mr. Cameron, the acting Colonial secretary, by reason of his reflections on the members of the Mauritius Civil Service; and whether he proposes to take any, and, if so, what action in the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: At the request of the Secretary of State, the Governor is sending home a full report in this matter, and Lord Elgin must await its receipt before determining on any action.

Abolition of Slavery on the Zanzibar Coast Strip.

SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how the amount of £40,000, which it is estimated will be required as compensation to owners of slaves in the Zanzibar Coast strip for loss occasioned by their emancipation during 1907–8 is arrived at; and what precautions will be taken to safeguard the Exchequer against fraudulent claims.

MR. CHURCHILL: From a rough census made in 1901 it would appear that there were 15,039 slaves in the province of Seyidie and Tanaland at that time. The sum of £40,000 has been arrived at by assuming that the number of slaves has been reduced by enfranchisement or death to 10,000, and that the average cost of a slave is £4. The amount paid by Zanzibar for compensation—namely, £30,000—has also been taken as some guide by the local authorities. With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's Question, it is proposed to follow as closely as possible the procedure adopted in 1897 in Zanzibar and to enact an Ordinance embodying *mutatis mutandis* the principles contained in Sultan Hamud's decree. The draft of the Ordinance is now under consideration.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1350.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): Is not the amount proposed to be paid for each individual slave larger than has ever been paid before?

MR. CHURCHILL'S reply was inaudible.

Kaid Sir Harry Maclean.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can now state the terms demanded by Raisuli for releasing Kaid Sir H. Maclean.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir Edward Grey): My right hon. friend is not in a position to make any addition to his reply to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for Blackpool on the 25th instant. †

University College Grants.

SIR W. J. COLLINS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Treasury have now considered the Report of the permanent advisory committee on University college grants; and when the awards to the various colleges concerned will be made public.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. ASQUITH): The Answer is in the affirmative. The Report of the Committee and the Treasury Minute thereon have been laid on the Table, and will be distributed in the course of a few days.

Beer Hawking in London.

MR. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been drawn to the practice of hawking beer from door to door in many districts in London and elsewhere; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of including in his forthcoming licensing legislation drastic provisions to put an end to this practice.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. ASQUITH): The practice of delivering beer at private houses from traders' vans in execution of orders previously received is widespread. Provided, however, orders for it have previously been given there is nothing illegal in the practice. It is of course probable that cases of genuine hawking occur, i.e., the delivery of beer to persons who have not previously ordered it. But the law is sufficiently strong to deal with such cases when detections can be made.

Motor Bus Accidents.

MR. T. DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the accident to a motor omnibus on Sunday last, when many people were seriously and some dangerously injured; is he aware that lives are daily sacrificed owing to careless driving and imperfect mechanism of the motor omnibuses which run in the London streets; and whether he proposes to take measures to put a stop to this unnecessary sacrifice of human life and limb.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.); Inquiry is being made into the cause of this accident; but I may say that the omnibus in question is reported to have been well constructed and the driver has the reputation of being skilled and careful. The number of fatal accidents from motor-omnibuses is not so great as the hon. Member suggests. In the last three months (April to June) seven such accidents occurred. Everything that is possible is being done by the companies to devise means of preventing skidding.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) asked the Prime Minister if he was aware that when the Motor Act was brought in the Minister in charge stated that it was only a temporary measure. Was it proposed to introduce further legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

Canadian and Australian Customs.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the fact that the customs duties collected in Canada on imports from the United Kingdom amounted in the year 1905–6 to more than £2,500,000, and that the customs duties collected in the Australian Commonwealth on imports from the United Kingdom amounted in 1906 to about £3,750,000, if he can say approximately what were the amounts of the duties collected in the United Kingdom on imports from Canada and the Australian Commonwealth respectively during the last financial year; and, if not, whether he will consider the advisability of obtaining such statistics as will show approximately the amount of the duties which are levied this year and in future years in the United Kingdom on goods imported from the various self-governing Colonies and from India.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxix., 131.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I must refer my hon. friend to the reply I gave to a Question put by him on the 30th April.† I am advised by the Commissioners of Customs that the results to be obtained from a compilation of the statistics to which he refers would not warrant the expenditure which would be involved. I hope, however, that the matter will be considered in the course of the autumn by the Committee for the revision of the Trade Accounts.

Traders' Appeals to the Railway Commission.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the frequency of cases in which traders have grievances against railway companies, but are unable to obtain redress owing to the great expense attending proceedings in the Court of the Railway and Canal Commission; and whether he has considered, or will consider, the propriety of appointing traffic inspectors, with powers to inquire and report in matters of rates, accommodation, and facilities, similar to the powers at present possessed by the inspecting officers of the Board of Trade in reference to engineering matters and public safety.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: As I have already stated in this House, I am fully aware of the desirability of securing as cheap and expeditious a means of dealing with traders' complaints as the circumstances of the case permit, and the whole subject is engaging my earnest attention. I cannot, however, at present make any announcement as to the precise steps to be taken with this object, which would probably necessitate legislation.

Unemployed Grant.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if the £200,000 proposed as a grant for the unemployed will be expended this winter on the same objects and on the same general plan which was followed last year.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. JOHN BURNS): It is proposed that generally the grant should be expended for the same purposes as last winter; but my right hon. friend is not at present in a position to say anything as to the details of the arrangements which will be made.

Afforestation.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if any arrangements are being made for the continuance and extension of the work of afforestation commenced last year to find useful work for the unemployed.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. JOHN BURNS): Any proposals as to temporary work to be provided under the Unemployed Workmen Act are matters for the local bodies under that Act. My right hon. friend has no information at present as to how far schemes relating to afforestation may be contemplated by those bodies, but any such schemes, if submitted to him, will receive his sympathetic consideration.

Sugar Beet Cultivation.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will apply a portion of the unemployed fund this year towards the encouragement of the culture of sugar beet and the erection of sugar mills in Lincolnshire and Suffolk, as that industry gives the maximum amount of employment during the growing period and also during the winter when the sugar is manufactured.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. JOHN BURNS): My right hon. friend does not think he can add anything to the Answer he gave to a similar Question by the hon.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 674.

Member on 7th March last.† As he then stated, it rests with the local bodies under the Unemployed Workmen Act to propose schemes of temporary work for the unemployed; but he added that he would not regard with favour a proposal that a factory for the manufacture of sugar should be established out of the grant.

Hyde Postmen's Duties.

MR. DUNCAN SCHWANN (Cheshire, Hyde): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he received, in April last, a memorial from the postmen of the Hyde borough postal district asking for the withdrawal of rotating postal morning deliveries of letters in the said district; if so, whether a favourable answer can be given; and whether he is aware that public inconvenience has been caused owing to the uncertainty in the time of the delivery of letters consequent upon the changes in making the deliveries.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.; for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): The memorial from the Hyde postmen to which the hon. Member refers has received my right hon. friend's careful consideration, and the memorialists have been informed that he is unable to find any reasonable ground for objection to the system of rotation recently introduced at Hyde. The rotation admits of a more equal division of inconvenient duties, and he regards it as being fairer to the staff as a whole, and as lending itself to more efficient working. He is not aware that public inconvenience has been caused by the alteration.

Training College Regulations.

MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, under the training college Regulations, it will be allowable to interview the candidates for admission to a college; and, if so, what kind of questions, if any, may be put to a candidate at such interview.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The new Regulations for training colleges do not prohibit an interview as distinguished from an examination. But if appeal were made to the Board by a candidate who had been refused admission to a college, and if it should appear that the candidate had been questioned at an interview as to his religious belief, or as to any other matter which would come within those grounds which under the Regulations will not be deemed "reasonable," the Board would regard this as strong evidence that the refusal of admission had in such a case been made on improper grounds.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared on behalf of the Board of Education to distinguish between the oral examination and questions at an interview.

MR. MCKENNA: If by oral examination the noble Lord means an examination on the educational qualifications of the candidate I think it would be easy to make the distinction.

Denominational Schools and the Grant.

MR. FELL: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Wokingham Division of Berks, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether a denominational school now in course of construction (under a scheme formed by the Board of Education, and sealed on 21st December, 1905), with the assistance of a building grant from the local education authority, can when completed receive the higher grant without surrendering its denominational character if is declared necessary to the area under Article 43 of the Regulations.

MR. MCKENNA: Taking the Question in the very general form in which it is put to me and in the natural sense of the words, the answer is in the negative. But if the Question relates to the Ranelagh Foundation, Whitfield, the reply is that Article 43 only refers to secondary schools that have been on the grant list for the year 1906–7, which is not the case in that instance. As regards there being or not being anything in the scheme which would make it impossible for the school to comply with the regulations to be fulfilled for receiving the higher grant, I have nothing to add to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member on Thursday last.‡

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 977.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxix., 142.

Merionethshire Voluntary School Teachers' Salaries.

Lord R. CECIL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the action of the Merionethshire local education authority in withholding from the teachers in the voluntary schools their salaries till after the holidays, though the teachers in the council schools are paid before the holidays; and what steps he proposes to take in order to bring to an end a state of things which, by destroying harmony of administration, necessarily militates against the efficiency of the non-provided schools.

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, Sir, the noble Lord himself has been good enough to call my attention to this matter. I deeply regret that any teachers should be subjected to hardship owing to the anomalous conditions imposed by the Act of 1902, and I am communicating with the local education authority on the subject.

Lord R. CECIL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that the teachers in the voluntary schools in the county have not received their salaries for the quarter ended 30th June; that the schools are now closed for the holidays, and the teachers are not able to take advantage of the holidays owing to their salaries not having been paid; and whether this is part of what is known as the Welsh revolt, a policy of petty persecution, inaugurated by the President of the Board of Trade?

*Mr. SPEAKER: The last Question of the noble Lord would not, I think, have passed the examiners at the Table.

Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): Will the right hon. Gentleman urge the local authority to pay the salaries at the earliest possible date?

Mr. McKENNA: The Act of 1902 is somewhat obscure as to the powers of the Board of Education and the local education authority in relation to certain matters, and I am not quite certain what the powers are in this respect. With regard to the Question of the noble Lord, I have nothing further to add.

Lord R. CECIL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is not the duty of the local education authority to secure the due efficiency of the schools, and whether it is possible that the due efficiency of schools can be secured so long as teachers are treated in this way?

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, Sir. It is part of the duty of the local education authority to maintain the efficiency of a school; but what is efficiency and how far the interpretation of that word by my predecessor affects the present state of things I cannot say.

Mr. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): Are we to understand that these voluntary school teachers were not paid their salaries due on 30th June, that in consequence many were not able to take their holidays, and that the Board of Education declares its inability to find any remedy for such a state of things?

Mr. McKENNA: No, Sir, I have not said that. The right hon. Gentleman is, perhaps, unaware that the teachers are primarily the servants of the managers, and are at perfect liberty to recover their salaries from the managers and can sue the managers for their salaries. There is no doubt that the managers could recover the amount they would have to pay from the local education authority. There is the remedy, and that remedy can be taken by the teachers themselves.

Mr. LYTTELTON: Are we to understand that the right hon. Gentleman says that the Board of Education has no duty in the matter, and that the teachers are to be left in the impossible situation of suing the managers?

Mr. McKENNA: I have already stated that the Act of 1902 contains many anomalous provisions. Amongst these is the extraordinary one that the local education authority is to pay the teachers, but not to appoint them. The responsibility for the payment of the teachers rests upon the managers. The local education authority has ultimately to pay, but the teachers have to look immediately, not to the local education authority, but to the managers.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The right hon. Gentleman admits that under the Act the local education authority has the obligation to pay the teachers. It is admitted also that there is default in these payments. Does the right hon. Gentleman say that he is powerless to enforce that payment?

MR. McKENNA: I do not say that. Ultimately the local managers can enforce payment; but it is not quite clear at what stage they can do so. The teacher is primarily the servant of the managers.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Board of Education will do their utmost to get these salaries paid at once?

MR. McKENNA: I have already replied to the Question on the Paper, and I will repeat it if the hon. Gentleman wishes. I deeply regret that any teacher should be subjected to any hardship owing to the anomalous conditions imposed by the Act of 1902, and I am communicating with the local education authority on the subject.

MR. EVELYN CECIL: Can the right hon. Gentleman say Yes or No to the Question whether the Board will do their best to get these salaries paid at once?

MR. McKENNA: I have already said that I have replied fully to the Question on the Paper.

MR. LYTTELTON; I must press the right hon. Gentleman. He has said he is communicating with the local education authority. Does that communication contain an intimation from him that they should pay these teachers at once?

MR. McKENNA; When the correspondence between myself and the local education authority is complete I shall be happy to make any communication on the subject.

LORD R. CECIL; I will call attention to the matter again on Monday.

Patent Appeals.

MR. LIDDELL (Down, W.), I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General how many patent appeals are at present awaiting a hearing; what is the date of the notice of appeal in the longest outstanding case; aud what are the reasons for the delay in these cases.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said that there were 15 patent appeals awaiting hearing; that the date of the longest outstanding appeal was 11th December, 1906, but that some entered since had been already heard, and that he could not give details as to the reasons.

Dog Poisoning in Sutherlandshire.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the procurator fiscal intends to take any action to discover and prosecute the dog poisoners in the neighbourhood of Skelbo, Sutherlandshire; and whether he is aware that this dog poisoning in the Highlands of Scotland is carried on entirely in the interest of game preserving.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The matter is in the hands of the criminal authorities. I have no information on the latter portion of my hon. friend's Question.

MR. MORTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry?

MR. SINCLAIR: I have done my best to inform myself.

MR. MORTON: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman ascertain if the statement in my Question is correct?

MR. SINCLAIR: I have obtained no evidence so far.

Crofters and Ground Game.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the crofters in the crofting districts under The Crofters Act, 1886, have the use and benefit of The Ground Game Act, 1881.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): The Ground Game Act, 1880, applies to "every occupier of land" and therefore to a crofter. There is no Ground Game Act, 1881.

Stornoway and Carloway Road.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Congested Districts Board can see their way to provide the funds requisite for the completion of the road between Stornoway and Carloway, Island of Lewis.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Congested Districts Board are not at present prepared to provide the very large sum required to complete this road.

Shader (Lewis) Landing-place.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the plans for the proposed works at the landing-place at Shader, Island of Lewis, which were forwarded to him by the Ross-shire County Council in February last, have yet been approved by the Board of Trade; and, if not, will he state the cause of the delay.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Board of Trade have intimated that they have decided to proceed with this application and are in communication with the county council.

Dog-Poisoning in Ross-shire.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the procurator fiscal has yet seen his way to take action with a view to bring to justice the person or persons responsible for the numerous cases of dog poisoning in the Kilmuir and Logie districts of Ross-shire.

MR. SINCLAIR: The procurator fiscal at Tain reports that he has given this matter attention, that the police are still actively pursuing their investigations, but so far no evidence sufficient to warrant proceedings against any person has been obtained.

MR. WEIR: I am sorry to hear it.

Balinakill Burial Ground.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether a new site for a burial ground at Balinakill, in the parish of Uig, Island of Lewis, has yet been prepared for interments; and, if not, will he state the cause of the delay.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am informed that a new site has been selected and is ready for interments.

River Deel—Askeaton Weir.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he can say whether he will institute an inquiry into the necessity for a queen's gap in the weir in the River Deel at Askeaton, in the county of Limerick, so that the salmon may have easy access to the upper reaches of the river; and, if so, whether those interested in fishing may give evidence at it.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR IRELAND (Mr. T. W. RUSSELL, Tyrone, S.): The Department fail to see the utility of such an inquiry, as they have no power to compel any alteration to be made in the weir referred to; but if those interested in the fisheries of this river can make arrangements with the present occupier—such as by compensating her for the deterioration of her fishery which would most probably result from carrying out the desired alterations—the Department will give any assistance they can in the matter.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): Cannot the hon. Gentleman see his way to holding the inquiry into the fishery of the Shannon promised by the late Chief Secretary?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL asked for notice of the Question.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that this weir being perpendicular, fish cannot get to the upper regions of the river? What steps will be taken to remove the complaints in regard to this?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Department have no legal power in the matter.

MR. JOYCE: Cannot it order an inquiry?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Yes, but no result could possibly follow.

MR. JOYCE: We will look to Parliament for that.

Police Protection at Newmarket.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in reference to the case of Mr. Owen Daly, Meelin, Newmarket, and the establishment of a police hut, whether he is aware that Mr. Daly wrote on the 6th May last to District Inspector O'Neil asking that the police escort should not accompany him on private or public business; and, in regard to the extra police in this peaceable district, are the constabulary authorities entitled to quarter extra police, involving extra cost to the ratepayers, on a district on their own motion without reference to public opinion and in opposition to the resolutions of the local district councils.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): It is the fact that Mr. Daly wrote to the district inspector asking that the police should not accompany him to fairs and markets. The danger, however, lies nearer home, and the police authorities, who are responsible for the peace of the district, were of opinion that the police who are employed in protecting Daly at home could not safely be withdrawn. The inspector-general informs me that the subject is again receiving his attention, and he will have the police removed at the earliest possible moment consistent with the man's safety.

Viceregal Commission on the Poor Law.

Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Local Government Board propose to take any steps to carry out such recommendations of the Viceregal Commission on the Poor Law as do not require legislation; and, in particular, whether it is intended to build any sanatoria for the treatment of consumption, or to adapt for the purpose any existing buildings.

Mr. BIRRELL: If the local authorities concerned should desire that effect may be given to any particular recommmendations of the Viceregal Commission which can be carried out under the existing law, the Local Government Board will give prompt and favourable consideration to the matter. Sanatoriums for consumption can be provided under the existing law with the assent of the district councils. I may add that the Government are anxious that such administrative changes as can be now made should be undertaken without delay, and are considering what steps may be taken with that object.

Maryborough Assault Case—Mr. Thomas L. Hodgins, J.P.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings at the Maryborough, Queen's County, Petty Sessions on Tuesday, 2nd instant, when a man named Thomas L. Hodgins, who is the occupier of an evicted farm at Cullinagh, Queen's County, was convicted for assaulting and wounding a man with a whip on the public road; whether this Thomas L. Hodgins is a magistrate for King's County; and will his conduct be brought under the notice of the Lord Chancellor.

Mr. BIRRELL: At the petty sessions referred to Mr. Hodgins, J.P., and Michael Bowe each prosecuted the other. Mr. Hodgins charged Bowe with using abusive language to him, and Bowe charged Mr. Hodgins with striking him with a whip as he drove past. Mr. Hodgins was fined 2s. 6d., and the charge against Bowe was dismissed. Mr. Hodgins has held an evicted farm for the past twenty-five years, and Bowe lives near the farm. It has not been considered necessary to bring the matter to the notice of the Lord Chancellor.

Police and Cattle Driving.

Mr. MEEHAN (Queen's County, Leix); I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware if it is part of the duty of the police in Ireland to herd the cattle on the lands occupied by planters and eleven-months men; can he say in what parts of Queen's County this duty has been imposed on the police; how many police are engaged on this work in the sub-district of Ballinakill; and will the services of the police be given generally to the farmers whose cattle may break fence and stray from their owner's land.

Mr. BIRRELL: It is not the duty of the police to act as herdsmen, and the police authorities inform me that the police have not been so employed in Queen's County or elsewhere. In the sub-district of Ballinakill police patrols have from time to time visited a farm from which the cattle had been driven. In so doing the police were performing their ordinary duty of giving protection where it is needed.

MR. DELANY asked if he could have the assistance of a few Royal Irish Constabulary to look after his cattle?

MR. BIRRELL: I am afraid not.

Abbleyleix Outrage Report.

MR. MEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Report of an outrage at Abbeyleix, Queen's County, in which it was stated that a two-year old filly was disembowelled and left to die in agony; whether a claim for malicious injury was made by the owner of the animal; and, if the claim was investigated by the County Court Judge on the 20th June last, can he say what was the result of the investigation.

MR. BIRRELL: The alleged malicious injury referred to in the Question was investigated by the local police, who formed the opinion that the injury had probably resulted from an accident. The owner made a claim for compensation for malicious injury, but the County Court Judge disallowed it, as he too came to the conclusion that the horse was accidently killed.

MR. DELANY asked if this alleged outrage had not been published in the Press and could not the right hon. Gentleman get the denial as widely circulated.

MR. BIRRELL said he hoped the papers would give equal publicity to his reply.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Send it to Lord Ashtown's libel agency.

Commissioners of National Education.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Government have the power to call for the resignation of any or all of the Commissioners of National Education on the grounds of old age or other unfitness to perform the duties of the office.

MR. BIRRELL: Under the terms of the Supplemental Charter of 1861 each of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland holds office during the pleasure of the Lord-Lieutenant.

MR. MURPHY was understood to inquire if some of these Commissioners ought not to be called on to retire on account of age.

MR. BIRRELL said that that was a most delicate question. He was not aware that any of them were incapable by reason of old age of discharging their duties.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: They could not be a worse body than they are.

Protestant Boys at Roman Catholic Schools at Belfast.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the results of the inquiries made by him in consequence of the information given him by the hon. and gallant Member for East Down with reference to two Protestant boys, William James Welsh and Samuel Welsh, who are at present detained, against the wishes of their father, in a Roman Catholic institution; and is he now prepared to have the boys restored to their father.

MR. BIRRELL: I have ascertained that each of these boys was immediately after birth baptised in the religion then professed by their father William Welsh, namely, that of Roman Catholic. At a later date each of the boys appears to have been baptised according to the rites of the Protestant Church. Upon hearing from the hon. Member for East Down that the father was residing at Ballydonnell, I directed that inquiries should be made from the man himself as regards the application which purported to have been made on his behalf. In the meantime Welsh had left Ballydonnell. I have since received from William Welsh's mother a letter, dated Belfast, 28th July, [stating that her son, the father of the boys, was staying with her, and that he did not wish the boys to be removed from the industrial school, as he had changed his mind, and further that he had written to that effect to the hon. Member who puts the present Question and also to the solicitor who made the application for the boys' discharge. Welsh appears to be of somewhat uncertain mind as regards his religious belief, and I do not propose to do anything in the matter until I have succeeded in having inquiries made from him personally.

Cattle Driving near Killarney.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether information has reached him of a case of cattle driving at Coolcuslough Mountain, near Killarney, on Sunday evening 21st July, when the farmer, in his efforts to protect his stock, was set upon by about twenty members of the United Irish League armed with sticks, knocked down, and otherwise assaulted; whether adequate police protection is being afforded to farmers in that neighbourhood; and, if not, will he take steps to arm farmers in like circumstances for protection from such assaults.

MR. BIRRELL: It has been reported to the police that nine head of cattle were driven off the mountain referred to on the 21st instant, and that two of the owners of the cattle were assaulted. The police are informed that, with the exception of one of the owners, none of the persons concerned are members of the United Irish League. The case had no connection with the agitation against the grazing system. Up to the present there has been no necessity for giving police protection to farmers in this district, but if occasion should arise full protection will be afforded.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: If the outrage was not due to the grazing agitation, what was the motive for it?

MR. BIRRELL: I have information which I do not think I am justified in giving, but the police are satisfied there are other causes. Generally speaking the district is of a peaceable character.

Benmore (Galway) Outrage.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, on the night of the 21st instant, Thomas Corcoran, of Benmore, near Bullaun, county Galway, while returning from his father's house to his own, was fired at by at least two persons, who were concealed on either side of the road; that Corcoran was seriously wounded in the back, legs, and arm, and now lies in a serious condition in his father's house; and whether, seeing that Corcoran was boycotted for retaining a farm which he had obtained from the Estates Commissioners and which the local branch of the United Irish League had ordered him to surrender, he will say whether this is considered by the police to be the motive for the attack, and what steps have been taken by the police.

MR. BIRRELL: It is the fact that Thomas Corcoran was fired at and severely wounded, but I am glad to learn that he is making a good recovery. Three persons have been arrested for the offence, and while the proceedings are pending it would be irregular to make any statement as to the details of the case.

Borrisokane Cattle Driving Prosecution.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether a force of 400 police are to be drafted into the town of Borrisokane, in the county of Tipperary, on the 7th August next, the day on which a number of persons will be tried at petty sessions there for driving cattle off the untenanted and grazing land in the district; and, if so, whether, seeing that the fact of such a force of police being there will only tend to exasperate the people instead of keeping the peace, he will take steps, under these circumstances, to keep the extra force of police away from the town on that day.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of policemen to be employed on the occasion in question has not yet been determined, but the police authorities will send a sufficient force to preserve the peace and keep order in the Court and its vicinity. The responsibility for preserving the peace rests with the police authorities, and I do not propose to interfere with their discretion in the matter. The hon. Member may rest assured that the police will not interfere with the people unless interference should be absolutely necessary.

Labourers (Ireland) Act—Advances under Clause 19.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any labourers holding cottages and allotments of land from rural district councils have obtained advances for the purchase of parcels of land, under Clause 19 of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1906; will he explain how, in case such labourers may be declared eligible for advances from the Estates Commissioners, they are to be provided with residences and suitable farm buildings; have the Estates Commissioners the necessary power to expend money for these purposes; and, if not, will he state how Clause 19 of the Labourers Act is to be made workable.

MR. BIRRELL: The reply to the first part of the Question is in the negative. Applications have been received from labourers for parcels of land on estates which have not yet been sold, and these will be duly considered by the Estates Commissioners when distributing the untenanted land on such estates. The Commissioners would appear to have power, under Section 12 of the Act of 1903, to make grants for building purposes in such cases, but having regard to the limited amount of money in the Reserve Fund, and to other claims upon that fund, it does not seem probable that in the exercise of their discretion the Commissioners will be able to make grants to labourers who may receive parcels of land.

Sir Percy FitzPatrick.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask whether the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies has seen the report of the attack made upon him in the Transvaal Parliament by Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, and whether, in view of the great weight which attaches to Sir Percy's words, he will give it the answer which it deserves.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, I think my best answer would be silence.

Irish Teachers and the Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education will be put in funds to undertake the payment of teachers' premiums under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have nothing to add to my Answer of the 17th instant.†

MR. SLOAN: Am I to understand that the managers of the schools are held responsible?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Yes, they are legally liable.

Irish Labourers Acts Loans.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can say when the Local Loans Bill will be taken; and whether it is his intention to insert a clause in it allowing the rural district councils in Ireland to repay the outstanding loans in connection with the Labourers (Ireland) Acts at $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., principal and interest, in the period of $68\frac{1}{2}$ years.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot fix the precise date, and thinks it would be premature to make any announcement as to the details of the proposals for dealing with the loans referred to, until the Bill is introduced.

Irish Trade Statistics.

MR BOLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can explain the reason of the delay in circulating the list of Irish imports and exports for 1905, seeing that they were laid upon the Table of the House on the 22nd instant.

MR. RUNCIMAN: This Paper will be circulated, I understand, on Friday next.

Emigration from Ireland.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that posters and other advertisements are exhibited in Irish post offices, encouraging persons to emigrate from Ireland; and whether, in view of the fact that two costly Government Departments, namely, the Congested Districts Board and the Department of Agriculture, have been brought into existence mainly for the purpose of checking emigration by the establishment of sound economic conditions, he will take steps to prevent his Department from being employed as an agency in the opposite direction.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for MR. SYDNEY BUXTON): Notices giving information to intending emigrants have been exhibited at the request of the Colonial Office at all Post Offices in the United Kingdom for many years, and my right hon. friend sees no sufficient reason for discontinuing the practice.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 673.

Ireland and the Special Reports on Educational Subjects.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is now in a position to state the result of the representations made to the writer of Volume 17 of the Special Reports on Educational Subjects as to the unwarrantable reflection on Irish educational efforts made on page 118 of that volume; and whether the writer of the Report has taken any steps to acquaint himself with the work of the Gaelic League in proceeding on lines similar to those adopted by Bishop Grundtvig in instituting the Danish people's high schools, of which this writer approves so highly.

MR. MCKENNA: Copies of the Questions and Answers relating to this matter were sent to, the writer of the Report referred to who has duly acknowledged them. I have no information as to the second paragraph of the Question.

MR. BOLAND: Has the writer denied the accuracy of my statement or otherwise?

MR. MCKENNA: I gather that in acknowledging the receipt of the Questions and Answers, he said he did not agree with the views of the hon. Gentleman, but he has made no representation to me on the subject.

Conferment of Honours.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will advise His Majesty that, in all creations of peerages and baronetcies, the public services for which such honours are conferred shall be set out it the patents, as is done in the case of warrants for the order of the Victoria Cross.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): There are particular reasons why this course should be taken in the case of the Victoria Cross, which is always conferred for some specified act of bravery, but it would be impossible to extend this practice to all cases of the conferment of honours.

MR. MARKHAM: Would there be any difficulty whatever in taking this course when men like Lord Kelvin receive their patents?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It would be difficult to express it fully.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman suggest that in all cases the purchase price should be engrossed?

[No Answer was returned.]

Second Ballots.

MR. MARKHAM: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is his intention to introduce legislation dealing with the question of second ballots, so that a clear majority of the electors voting in any constituency can return to this House the candidate they desire to elect; and whether he is aware that the Member for Jarrow recently received less than a third of the total votes polled and the Member for the Colne Valley 35 per cent. of the total votes polled.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have nothing to add to the statement I made in answer to a similar Question on 11th July.†

Civil Servants' Grievances.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he would consider the propriety of inquiring into the possibility of instituting a tribunal to which civil servants could refer their grievances, due regard being given to the necessary discipline which must be maintained throughout the service.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Member's suggestion is, I am sure, put forward with the best intentions, but I am disposed to think that the tribunal which he has in his mind would fail to secure the very objects that he desires. I conceive that it would give rise to grave departmental and interdepartmental friction, that it would tend to hamper the action or impair the responsibility of Ministers, and that it would add a further element of confusion to the whole question. I am afraid, therefore, that I am unable to hold out any hope to the hon. Member of his suggestion being adopted.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 63–4.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman be able to make any proposal next year for an improvement on the present state of things?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: "Next year" is a very wide term.

Pensions for Public Services.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the Acts 23 Geo. 3, c. 86, and 33 Geo. 3, c. 77, whereby an annuity of £2,000 has been conferred on all and every the heirs to whom the title of Lord Rodney shall descend; whether he is aware that to date the nation has paid seven holders of this title £248,000; and whether he can promise that the Government will bring in a Bill to end this annuity.

I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the letters patent dated 22nd December, 8 Will. 3, to the letters patent dated 29th June, 1715, and Acts 1 Geo. 1, No. 78, and 19 and 20 Vic., c. 59, whereby a pension of £2,880 net was conferred on the heirs of the Duke of Schomberg; whether he is aware that this pension has been reduced by commutations in 1855, 1876, 1877, and 1883, until at the present time £720 still continues to be paid to the heirs of this individual; will he state the amount to date that has been paid by the public to the heirs under these letters patent and Acts, including the capital amounts paid under the commutations dated above and the names of those heirs to-day to whom the £720 is paid, specifying the amounts paid to each; and whether he will give this House an assurance that he will introduce a short Bill next session to end this annuity.

I beg further to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the Act, 46 Geo. III., c. 146, whereby an annuity of £5,000 has been conferred on such persons to whom the title of Earl Nelson shall descend; that this annuity was in addition to a sum of £120,000 as a further provision for the family of the said Earl Nelson; whether he is aware that under this Act the nation has paid the Nelson family £625,000 to date; and whether he can give an assurance that next year this Government will bring in a short Bill to end this annuity.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As these three questions involve a considerable number of figures I propose to circulate the reply with the Votes.†

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the family of the Duke of Schomberg have never resided in this country, and that they have even refused a sixpence towards the monument to their great ancestor in St. Patrick's Cathedral?

MR. LEA: Will the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that next year he will introduce a Bill to put an end to these feudal anomalies?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is well known that there have been attempts, successful attempts in some instances, to deal with these annual charges in past years, and the financial authorities of the country are always ready to take that course whenever opportunity offers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that although Nelson was given immense sums of money his daughter was left to die in poverty and destitution?

[No Answer was returned.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somerset, Wellington) asked as to the business for Friday and Monday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that the first Order on Friday would be the Third Reading of the Evicted Tenants Bill. Afterwards other Bills would be taken if time permitted. He must ask the right hon. Gentleman to restrain his inquisitiveness as to Monday until the next day.

---

† See page 937.

THE GRANT TO LORD CROMER.

*MR. MARKHAM asked the Speaker whether a breach of privilege was not committed on the previous day, when the House of Lords expressed concurrence in a money grant to Lord Cromer before the matter had been discussed in the House of Commons. Must not all Money Bills originate in the House of Commons?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not understand that any Money Bill has been introduced or even contemplated in the House of Lords. I have no authority or control over the proceedings of the other House. I notice in the journal of the proceedings of the House of Lords that the House passed an Address expressing thanks to His Majesty and concurrence. I do not see that that gives me any *locus standi* or this House any cause of complaint.

MR. MARKHAM: The House of Lords concurred in a Resolution which had not been passed by this House.

*MR. SPEAKER: I beg the hon. Member's pardon. The House of Lords' Journal says, "His Majesty's most gracious message of Wednesday last considered, according to order, a humble Address of thanks and concurrence ordered *nemine contradicente* to be presented to his Majesty thereupon." I do not see that is any breach of our privileges.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The Resolution passed was one savouring of a money transaction, and I submit with great respect it was a breach of privilege. Every money grant has been initiated by this House since 1678, but in this case the Resolution was passed first in the House of Lords. The Peers surely cannot concur in a Resolution which has not been passed.

MR. SPEAKER: I am quite clear that no breach of privilege has been committed, and if we were to attempt to insist on a non-existent right we should only make ourselves ridiculous.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: As the Lords have done.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill):—Sir Edward Boyle, Mr. Barrie, Mr. Remnant, Mr. Charles Craig, Sir Samuel Scott, Mr. Nield, Mr. Staveley-Hill, Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Hills, Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. John Ward, Sir Randal Cremer, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. M'Killop, and Mr. Trevelyan.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to the capacity of Women to be elected and act as Members of County or Town Councils in Scotland." [Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) Bill [Lords].

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Motion made, and Question put, "That on this day, notwithstanding anything in Standing Order No. 15, Business other than Business of Supply may be taken before Eleven of the clock."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 176; Noes, 39. (Division List No. 352.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp't)
Benn, W. (T'w'r' Hamlets, S. Geo
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar,Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
French, Peter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Gulland, John W.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt.Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Captain Norton.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A. (Wor.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Staveley-Hill,Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

SUPPLY [19TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee) said it might be convenient to make a short statement on this Vote. The House was familiar with the dangers that had been discovered lurking in the composition of cordite, and the serious prospect which that fact opened up both for the Army and the Navy. The development of knowledge was comparitively recent as to the law which governed the composition of cordite. Since the Estimates were framed, however, that law had been more fully ascertained, and in his ignorance he would only state that if the condition of cordite did not vary according to the temperature at which it was stored, at least it depended on the temperature. After the Estimates were framed the Admiralty had to deal with the matter on their own responsibility. They had decided to apply cooling apparatus to the magazines in which cordite was stored in all the ships of the Navy. They proposed to deal first with the ships on hot stations or those about to proceed to hot stations. In the second place, they would apply the new system to all ships under construction or undergoing large refits; and, lastly, they would deal with the remaining ships in the Navy as opportunity occurred. Shortly after the decision of the Admiralty a Committee of scientific experts was appointed to report on the whole subject, under the presidency of Lord Rayleigh, and that Committee unanimously approved of the course which the Admiralty had adopted. It had been decided to test all cordite on the most extensive scale possible. It had also been decided that the oldest cordite in our possession should be the first to be used, and, finally, all cordite that had been long at hot stations, or on which suspicion was cast, would be destroyed. The same thing would have to be done with magazines on shore in certain places, but not, of course, at Gibraltar or Malta, where additional refrigerating apparatus was not required. The designs and plans for dealing with the shore stations were not yet in a forward condition, and nothing could be done in regard to them which would require to be paid for in the present financial year. It was estimated that the total cost of supplying cooling apparatus to magazines on ships was £500,000, and the estimated expenditure in the current financial year for this purpose would be £200,000.

The second topic on which he desired to say a few words was the programme relating to destroyers, on account of observations made both in and outside the House. The first thing he had to say was that it was the opinion of the Board of Admiralty that the two-Power standard was not applicable to the destroyer section of the British Navy—whether the two-Power standard or any other did not matter. The number of destroyers wanted depended on the use that was to be made of them, and not on the number which might be in possession of other Powers. Historically the destroyer was intended mainly as a weapon of attack against torpedo boats. In explaining the policy which had led to the adoption of the ocean-going destroyer fit for service at sea, he said that our requirements were determined on strategical grounds by the naval advisers of the Board of Admiralty. It was said that the provision this year was adequate. No hard and fast age limit was recognised, but the 27-knot destroyers were wearing out. There was also a steady annual output, the supply being five ocean-going destroyers and twelve coastal destroyers, or as they were now called turbine torpedo boats. He had obtained from the experts at the Admiralty a comparative statement as to the strength of destroyers here and abroad. Counting the coastal destroyers, he found that France had sixty-five torpedo boat destroyers, built, building, or projected, Germany eighty-three, and Great Britain

191. He was advised that, on the whole, the British flotilla of destroyers was superior in essential qualities to those of foreign Powers. The next point upon which he was going to say a word or two would be of more interest than the last and had reference to the cruiser policy of the Board of Admiralty. It had been said that their programme showed that they were in default in regard to cruisers, and he wanted the House to know what the position was. They were in no default. The total provision made for new construction was £8,100,000, and he had had a careful calculation made which showed that there was a cash provision going to cruiser construction amounting to £2,800,000 or more than a third of the whole sum. The vessels building included three "Invincibles," and each of them would cost nearly £1,730.000, nearly double what they cost in the old days. Then came the three cruisers of the "Minotaur" class, each costing £1,400,000. Next came four cruisers of the "Warrior" class, and the "Achilles," "Natal," "Cochrane," and "Warrior" had now passed into the Navy and had taken their position in the northern division of the Home Fleet. Each of these cruisers cost £1,200,000. The only remaining cruiser was the new departure sanctioned last year, the "Boadicea." She was to cost £350,000. It would be seen from this statement that the cruiser policy of the Board which preceded the present Board and of the present Board itself had been to build large armoured cruisers. That was the outstanding feature of the programme. The object having been attained in establishing our required lead and superiority in this type of vessel, the Board were now free to turn, and were turning, their attention to other cruiser types—one type an improvement on the "Scout" class, the other a type necessary for replacing the "Edgar" class. The "Boadicea" type of about 3,500 tons displacement might be designated as a third-class cruiser largely superior in coal endurance and armament to the "Scout" class and with high speed. The other type under consideration was required to take the place of the "Edgar" class, which were becoming worn out and were held no longer to satisfy later requirements as to speed, armament, and coal endurance. These types would be carefully studied with a view to their inclusion in next year's programme. The only other topic with which he wished to deal had bulked largely in public discussion outside the House, and that was the topic of repairs. It had been alleged that the repairs of the Fleet had been neglected, especially in the Home Fleet and in the special service vessels. In the second place it was said that this was due to the advent of a cheeseparing Liberal Government. In the third place, it was said that this policy had culminated in excessive discharges from the dockyards. He proposed to deal with those allegations in the order that they affected him most. All these charges affected him personally as Secretary to the Admiralty, because in matters of naval policy he was on the side of the repairers, and would rather keep the Fleet in repair than buy new vessels. As to the charge of parsimony, the figures he would give were not meant to institute invidious comparisons, but to repel them. In 1905–6, the last year before the present Government came into office, the provision for the repairs of the Fleet amounted to £2,019,515; but the actual expenditure fell short of that amount by £437,355. In the year 1906–7, when the present Government took over lock, stock, and barrel the Naval Estimates of the outgoing Government, which were found in a complete form, the provision made for repairs was £1,628,100; but the new Board spent £282,900 more than that amount. That was the cheeseparing. In the present financial year the provision was raised to £1,800,198, or £172,000 more than in the previous year, and up-to-date the Admiralty had overspent themselves to the extent of £44,250. The expenditure now proposed for repairs was, in this instance, larger than that which was proposed by the responsible professional officers, because he was determined to be on the safe side in respect to repairs, and at his suggestion the sum was considerably increased. He was not blaming the expenditure of former years, but merely vindicating the present Board when he repelled the injurious comparisons that had been made. With respect to the Home Fleet, early this year a special circular order was addressed to the Commander-in-Chief directing him to report once a quarter the state of his fleet

in regard to repairs. That circular order would in due course be extended to the other fleets. He had a synopsis of the reports made under this circular order with regard to the Home Fleet. Of battleships ready there were six at the Nore, three at Portsmouth, and two at Devonport. The only battleships not ready were the "Glory" (refitting at Portsmouth) and the "Cæsar" (refitting at Devonport). Of the armoured cruisers there were reported "ready, no defects," six at the Nore, three at Portsmouth, and three at Devonport. The one not ready was the "Cumberland," which was being prepared as a cadets' seagoing cruiser. Of the first-class cruisers there were ready, with no defects, three at Portsmouth and three at Devonport. The "Argonaut" and the "Terrible," at Portsmouth, were not ready, and the "Europa" was refitting at Devonport. Of the second-class cruisers all were ready, three at the Nore, three at Portsmouth, and two at Devonport. The special service vessels, which had been the object of special attacks, consisted of eleven battleships and ten cruisers laid up with skeleton crews. All the battleships were reported ready at five days notice; of the five first-class cruisers, all were ready at five days notice, except the "Hawk," which was refitting; of the four second-class cruisers one only, which was being refitted as a mine layer, was not ready. That was a satisfactory statement, and he would complete it by reading the result of the answers given to certain questions by the officers responsible for the repairs of the Navy. They amounted to this. The fleets in commission fully manned were in excellent condition. A few vessels in the Home Fleet were becoming due for refit in ordinary course, and it was much more economical to keep these vessels in commission with nucleus crews than it was to put them in the old Dockyard Reserve, as was done before the present organisation was adopted. The special service vessels were all in good condition and ready for service, except those actually in dockyard hands (two in number). Provision had been made in the Naval Estimates for this year for thoroughly re-fitting all vessels which required it when the Estimates were framed, and this work would be taken in hand during the year. The normal progress had in a few cases been slightly impeded by unexpected defects and accidents in important vessels, which were taken in hand and made good in preference to those in vessels of less importance. With this exception, the programme of repairs was progressing quite satisfactorily, and the money voted for repairs was being most economically applied, and with better results than before. The alterations and improvements, including fire-control, in details of comfort and fighting efficiency, were more extensive than at any previous period, and were being carried out without delay.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked whether the same information could be given with regard to destroyers as with regard to cruisers.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that it could not be given in the same detail. The last point in this indictment was that, in order to bring about this nefarious cheeseparing policy, the present Board of Admiralty had had to sacrifice the working man and to make discharges from the dockyards. He did not wish in this matter to make any reflections on the late Board of Admiralty. No man knew better than he how difficult was this question of the dockyards. In the nine months preceding December, 1905, and before the present Government came into office, the number of discharges from all causes, including deaths and natural wastage, was 6,733. In the period since they came into office, about eighteen months, there had been no discharges, but actually a small addition to the number of men employed in the dockyards, the number of additions being 171. A number of false and irresponsible statements had been made about this subject, and he was anxious to make the position clear. He was not making any charge against the late Government for having reduced the number of men by 6,733, as there might have been good reason for the discharges; it had made the work of the present Government easier, and removed the necessity for further discharges. He, however, strongly protested against the misstatements that the Navy had been allowed to go to rot and ruin because this "cheeseparing Government" would not provide the money and men necessary. He hoped the House would not think that he had spoken with undue heat. He was merely apologising for any temper he had shown in his statement on account of the provocation which he had received, out of the House at all events. He had never thought that he would live to see the day when he would be grateful, as he was grateful, for the existence of the National Navy League. He had not hitherto agreed with their policy, but he was on the other side now. Within the Navy League there was a "Navier" league, if he might use the expression, which, he was afraid, had been the source of a good deal of the controversy and irritation that had arisen. He would observe, however, that he had no personal feeling in the matter, and, in concluding this statement, which had already lasted too long, he hoped that he had not imported into it undue heat or personal feeling.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) said the right hon. Gentleman had omitted, in dealing with the Building Vote, to refer to the battleship programme. He had not told the Committee what the Government proposed with regard to that programme, which the right hon. Gentleman had previously stated was contingent upon certain things happening at The Hague Conference.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he could make no statement different from that which he had made last year in introducing Votes.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said he thought, perhaps, the last part of the right hon. Gentleman's remarks was the most important to the Committee. In the course of those remarks, which did not seem in the least too long, the right hon. Gentleman had begun with what he might call the small end of the wedge; he began with the question relating to cordite, then proceeded to the small vessels, the destroyers, then to cruisers, and lastly to repairs, and he would have passed away from the Vote altogether without reference to the most important class of ships that could be laid down, namely the battleships, but for the question which he had put with regard to them. The battleship programme this year was in a unique position owing to the undertaking which the Government had entered into last year, and which the right hon. Gentleman had detailed to the House in introducing this Vote last summer. His undertaking on that occasion was repeated by the First Lord of the Admiralty in March of this year, that the —

> "new construction for the year in the matter of battleships would include two, or, unless an understanding were arrived at with the naval Powers at The Hague Conference, three large armoured vessels of the 'Dreadnought' type."

The right hon. Gentleman stated that the Government adhered to that position. But could they not now say definitely whether they were going to lay down this third battleship or not? This was the last occasion on which the matter could be discussed during the present year, and surely there could be no longer in the minds of the Government any illusion as to what possibly could take place at The Hague Conference in reference to this question. They were aware, of course, that the Government were bringing forward, or were laying before The Hague Conference, a resolution on the subject of the limitation of armaments; but that resolution, as published in the Press—he presumed it was authentic—was of such a meek and belated character that he did not think it could really be supposed that it would in any way affect the British shipbuilding programme of this year, because even if it were passed—of course he had no means of knowing whether it would be accepted by the Conference or not—all it suggested was that this question of the limitation of armaments was more than ever urgent, and that it was desired that the Governments should resume the study of the question. But even if they resumed the study of the question, that surely would not be an undertaking between the naval Powers, such as was indicated by the right hon. Gentleman last year. It would be fairer to the House if the right hon. Gentleman would state definitely whether they were to have this third battleship or not. The right hon. Gentleman said he had no other statement to make than that which he made last year, and from what he then said they must assume that the

Government were going to proceed with it. No other construction could reasonably be put on the speech of last year or on the right hon. Gentleman's language just now. Between this question of the shipbuilding programme and the Hague Conference a peculiar connection had been established, and it was impossible to pass away from the subject of this Vote without making some reference to the undertaking into which the Government had entered. As regarded a resumption of the study of the question of limitation of armaments, speaking as an economist and a lover of peace, he regarded that invitation with some considerable apprehension, when viewed in the light of past experience. Previously, a study of the question had only led to a closer examination and more vivid appreciation by each Power of the armed strength of its rivals, followed in due course by an increased expenditure on its own defence. The right hon. Gentleman himself had used very significant language on that subject in introducing the Navy Estimates last year; he said—

> "The previous Conference had expired with the pious expression on its lips that great service would be rendered to humanity by agreeing to carry out a reduction of armaments. What happened? In the succeeding five years the expenditure on shipbuilding had risen from £68,500,000 to £101,000,000; in other words, since the Hague Conference made the suggestion, there had been an addition of 50 per cent. to the naval burdens of the world."

Those were undoubted facts, and as long as human nature remained the same, which would probably be for a good many centuries yet to come, he was afraid that a closer study of the question of armaments would be likely to lead to increased expenditure in the future as in the past. But they must assume, of course, after what had passed, that this third battleship in this year's programme had been at last removed from the bargain counter. He thought it was unfortunate that the net result of the Government's angling and manœuvring with it had been that this country would be forced into the invidious position of being the first definitely to increase its shipbuilding programme as a direct result of the deliberations at the Hague. If the exceedingly modest battleship programme which the Government had brought forward had not been tampered with in this way, it could have been gone on without exciting any comment whatsoever in foreign countries; and even if a miracle had occurred at the Hague, and foreign countries agreed to take any steps in the direction of a reduction of armaments, we should have been able to head the movement by striking off this battleship, which had been selected as the visible pledge of our pacific intentions. But, as it was, all through the past twelve months this ship had been alternately appearing and disappearing on the horizon, and he would suggest, when the vessel was really laid down, that it should be called "The Flying Dutchman," a name which would be indicative of its phantom career in the past, and an appropriate compliment to the place of its birth, the Hague. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the question of building or of dropping this one battleship was not the only inducement that the Government had held out at the Hague Conference. They had also offered to postpone the commencement of even their reduced programme to an abnormally late period of the year. The right hon. Gentleman, in explaining why they did this, said it was to emphasise to the Hague Conference the good faith of the British Government and their desire to bring about reduced armaments. He in no way questioned the good faith of the Government; he was perfectly certain that they were entirely sincere in putting forward that programme, even if they were innocently optimistic in the matter. But they had to face the facts and the consequences of that undertaking; and what was the effect, after all, of this second inducement held out to the Powers at the Hague, and which had met with no response whatever, as far as they could judge? It meant practically that the battleship programme of 1907–8 had been postponed until 1908–9, and consequently much valuable time had been lost. The only practical way to remedy this was to expedite the commencement of next year's building programme by laying down the new ships unusually early. This would not make up for all the lost time, but it would mitigate the delay which had occurred, and prove the good faith of the Government, not merely to foreign nations at the Hague, but what was far more important, to the people of this country. The Prime Minister, speaking to a deputation in regard to the Hague Conference, was very apologetic for the meagre results obtained, and he expressed the hope that "the flag would be kept flying." The question was which flag? The only flag which was of vital importance to the British race was the White Ensign flying over His Majesty's ships, and the lowering of that, even by a hand's-breadth, for the *beaux yeux* of any so-called Peace Conference, would be doing an irreparable injury to the whole British Empire. Would the Government undertake, in pursuance of the assurance they gave last year and which was repeated in the First Lord's statement last March, to expedite the commencement and prosecution of next year's shipbuilding programme. Before considering their needs in the matter of new ships it was essential first of all that they should know how many ships of full fighting efficiency they already possessed, and that was just the information which was so exceedingly difficult to obtain. There were tabulated statements, official and unofficial, in great variety, but no two of them agreed, and perhaps the greatest sinner from the point of view of inaccuracy and almost misrepresentation was the official Return which was annually furnished to the House and known as the Dilke Return. He did not, of course, accuse the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean of any complicity in the sins of that Return, and he understood that the right hon. Baronet was himself dissatisfied with it. That Return ought to be impeccable, because it was the one which went out to the world as the official statement of the fighting strength of the British Navy as compared with other navies. The right hon. Gentleman had said he was desirous that the Return should give "an accurate, complete and faithful picture as to the strength of the Navy." In view of the criticism which had been passed upon the Return he hoped the Admiralty would do what it could to make it a more faithful record and comparison of the great fleets of the world. The Admiralty admitted that the Return was not what it should be, and the First Lord had issued a revised statement of the naval strength of this country, in which the figures given were entirely different, and were based upon the somewhat curious assumption that battleships of twenty-five years of age and armoured cruisers built twenty years ago were efficient ships. Upon what basis of argument did he lay down those standards? According to the statement they had only thirty-nine effective battleships at the present time. All ships of previous date to the "Majestic" class were described as "obsolescent." He thought they might very well have been put down as obsolete. But this being so, what was the use of dragging in ships of twenty-five years old, which could not be considered effective in any sense of the word, and could only have been put in to decorate a paper return of strength? Those old ships did not add to the fighting strength of the Navy, and judging by the lessons to be drawn from the war between Russia and Japan, the presence of those old and obsolescent ships in the fighting squadrons only resulted in disaster. It was the presence of this class of ship which made the destruction of the Russian fleet so inevitable and overwhelming at the battle of Tsu-shima. Upon a previous occasion they were furnished with some details of the shipbuilding programmes of other Powers, and the right hon. Gentleman told them that there were no battleships of the "Dreadnought" class which had been actually laid down by any other country with the exception of Japan, and he distinctly said none had been laid down in Germany. Was the Secretary to the Admiralty now prepared to tell them the state of affairs in that respect? Did he still maintain that there were no "Dreadnoughts" being laid down in Germany? If he was right in his study of the German Naval Estimates, two "Dreadnought" battleships and one of the "Invincible" type of cruisers had been laid down by Germany, and the second instalment of money for those ships had already been voted. He did not think it was likely that the second instalment would have been provided in the case of those ships if they had not actually been laid down. In regard to cruisers, what did the First Lord mean by saying that armoured cruisers of twenty years of age were considered efficient? As far as he could gather from the official Returns provided, there were no such ships on the effective strength of any Navy in the world. He had examined the Returns, and he found that the oldest armoured cruisers shown in the lists of any Power were from six to ten years old, and in one instance twelve years, and even this included a large number of ships which were obsolescent. The right hon. Gentleman had given some interesting information in regard to the Government proposals on the question of cruisers. He welcomed the announcement which had been made that something would be done to remedy the great deficiency that existed in regard to cruisers. The right hon. Gentleman was quite justified in furnishing no details because they would belong to next year's programme. He hoped that in drawing up that programme the Board of Admiralty would take into consideration this fact in regard to the present deficiency in cruisers. They had been told that they possessed thirty-two armoured cruisers, but that total included ten of the earlier "County" class, which had been described by many competent naval officers who had served in them as being fit for very little else except to run away. They had great speed, it was true. but their armament was ridiculously small and consisted of only 6-inch guns, and they were lamentably inferior in that respect to the armoured cruisers of the same date belonging to Germany, the United States, Russia, and Japan. Then there was the newer class of "County" cruisers, of which there were six. It was true that the armament in this case was a little better and they possessed four 7½-inch guns. These, however, were also much inferior to most of the foreign vessels of the same date. Altogether he was afraid that these sixteen ships which cost the enormous sum of £12,000,000 were a very small addition to the fighting strength of the fleet. He was aware that the responsibility did not lie with the present Government, but the Government of the day had to take these matters into consideration when considering the question of cruisers. He hoped they would take into account what he had said about the "County" class of cruisers, which constituted no less than 30 per cent. of our whole strength of armoured cruisers. The Admiralty ought to take into consideration immediately the necessity of replacing those cruisers at a very much earlier date than appeared to be justified by their age. They had been given some information about destroyers. The right hon. Gentleman told them that in the opinion of the Admiralty the two-Power standard did not apply to the question of destroyers, but he did not say why. He thought that was a rather startling statement. He was himself prepared to admit that the two-Power standard should not apply to destroyers, and that it really ought to be a three or four-Power standard. But what was the standard that the Admiralty considered necessary? It would have been a great assistance to the Committee if the right hon. Gentleman had developed his argument further, and stated why this new theory was put forward by the Admiralty. It seemed to him strangely coincident with the fact that a large proportion of our destroyers were becoming obsolete. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give some idea of what was necessary. He told the Committee that Great Britain had 191 destroyers at the present time.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Including coastal destroyers.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said that was lumping two classes together. Was a coastal destroyer to be classed as a destroyer or a torpedo boat? They had been told that it was to be classed as a torpedo boat. This new system of classification made it impossible for the public to know what they had really got, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised if he adhered to the old line of demarcation, otherwise he was afraid the figures would have the effect of fogging any investigator who wished to know what the real strength was. From what the right hon. Gentleman had stated in his recent interjection he took it that the Government in applying the two-Power standard to destroyers had in mind a larger standard of destroyers, and that they would in the programme next year, or in the following year, use their best efforts to remedy the sudden blow which was about to fall on our destroyer strength, not only by the disappearance of the obsolescent ships, but of those which were quite obsolete, numbering between forty or fifty of our existing destroyers. On that point the right hon. Gentleman was somewhat obscure in his remarks, and it would be for the convenience of the Committee if he would give more information on the subject. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken at some length on the question of repairs. That was assuredly one of the most important questions that could possibly come up in connection with the fighting strength of the Navy. Of course, the fleet, however strong numerically, could not be considered useful for the purposes of war unless it was kept in a perfect state of repair. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that there had been exceedingly disquieting remarks made lately with regard to the state of repairs in the Fleet. He was glad indeed that in the statement he had made to-day the right hon. Gentleman had given categorical replies from officers in high command and in actual contact with the vessels concerned. He accepted without question the statement of the Board of Admiralty on this most important subject. He hoped that the facts which the right hon. Gentleman had given the Committee to-day would be fully and thoroughly reported so that they would be seen by the public and that they would do something to allay the genuine anxiety which had existed on this subject for several months. In dealing with the question of repairs he did not think the right hon. Gentleman was quite fair to the late Government in his desire to prove how good the present Government had been in avoiding cheese-paring in this important question. He gave the Committee to understand that the late Government had only spent in their last year about £1,500,000 on repairing the Fleet, whereas since the present Government came into office they had spent a larger sum, the amount for the present year being £2,000,000. The figure of £1,500,000 must not be taken as in any way a fair example of what the late Government had done. In the previous year 1904-5 the amount spent on repairs by the late Government was £2,886,000 and in the year before that the amount was £3,156,000, and the reason why such a small sum was required in the year before the late Government went out of office was that the repairs had been completed and brought up to a point never before equalled in the history of the British Navy. It was curious that the right hon. Gentleman had adopted this method of comparison, because it was a parallel to what the First Lord said in his statement last March to glorify the nucleus crews, and to show the remarkable results which were produced by the adoption of that system. Lord Tweedmouth had compared January, 1907, with January, 1904, but he left out of account, surely by accident, that 1904 was the year in which the late Government set itself to spend the almost unheard of amount of £3,000,000 on repairs. By the end of that year the whole of the repairs of the Fleet had been completed, and it was at this point, when it had been brought up to an unexampled state of perfection, that the nucleus crews came into existence for the first time. The present Government took over the Fleet absolutely in the pink of condition, and if it had been maintained in that condition since it would be a tribute to the nucleus crews and a remarkable proof of the success of that policy. But statements had been made by authorities who must be regarded as responsible, amongst them being Sir William White, to the effect that it was beyond the power of nucleus crews to maintain their ships in a proper state of repair, and that the amount of money provided was in any case insufficient for the purpose. What the right hon. Gentleman said to-day was undoubtedly an answer to that, but he thought it would have been fairer if the right hon. Gentleman and the First Lord had not attempted to take credit to the present Government for this extra expenditure on repairs, considering that the Fleet was taken over from the late Government in a state of repair which had never before been equalled. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to state what was the difference between an "annual" refit and an "extensive" refit. Was an annual refit limited in point of time to the forty days which was laid down in the Admiralty Memorandum of December, 1904, as being the maximum period for which any battleship might be absent from the Fleet, in dockyard hands, during the year? He had asked the right hon.

Gentleman certain definite questions, and he hoped that he might be successful in getting equally definite replies. He did not press these questions in any captious or Party spirit. He should be the last to wish in any way to add to the difficulties of the many-sided task which must confront any Board of Admiralty, but the right hon. Gentleman was aware that there had been a widespread amount of anxiety about certain recent developments of Admiralty policy. No one regretted more than he did that the old reputation of the Admiralty for a kind of infallibility had apparently suffered during the last two or three years. He thought it was only proper that the right hon. Gentleman should do all he could to allay the anxiety which existed. Secrecy was, of course, essential in certain cases, and it might be very important where the designs of new ships were concerned. The House of Commons and the Press in the past had shown a patriotic readiness to abstain from pressing for information of that kind. He hoped the Admiralty would reciprocate that confidence, and would not refuse to give to the House and the taxpayers of the country information which was perfectly legitimate, and which they had a perfect right to receive before granting to the Government the vast sums of money asked for in this Vote.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that if he differed from his hon. friend who had just sat down it was not for any Party reason, but because he held other views as to the best method of keeping up the British Fleet at the proper standard. He congratulated the hon. Gentleman on having recovered from a very serious illness and on the vigour of his speech. The hon. Gentleman began his speech with several remarks on the battleship programme and the need of docks for these battleships. He himself attached to the latter greater proportional importance. The hon. Member had, he thought, handled the Government a little roughly in regard to the battleship programme when they remembered the admissions which the late Government had made. Now, what was proposed on this occasion was very similar to what happened on two occasions when Mr. Goschen was First Lord of the Admiralty. Mr. Goschen then pointed out that we were in a position in advance of foreign Powers and that we could afford to regulate our shipbuilding programme to some extent according to what was being done by those foreign Powers—that we could hold out to foreign Powers that we should have to build certain ships or should not build certain ships according to what they did. What was done this year in anticipation of the action of the Government at the Hague was only an extension of that principle. It was not a unique action on the part of the Government as the hon. Gentleman seemed to think. On this occasion, as on the last, when the programme of the Navy was debated, there had been a gratifying absence from the discussion in the House of any of that undue alarm or panic which had been shown —or rather which had been attempted to be got up in certain portions of the Press, and which, he was glad to say, had failed. He for one should not regret that that determined attempt had been made, for he thought it would tend in the future to check the efforts of hon. Members who wished to keep the Navy up to the standard. If a panic was got up when there was no ground for it, the next time when there might be some cause for it it might be discounted from the failure of this attempt. He was glad to see that Captain Pretyman, who had been a former Secretary to the Admiralty, in his first speech as a candidate for a seat in the House was reported in the previous day's paper to have said that he had no objection whatever to offer to the shipbuilding programme of the year. And that was the position which the Opposition officially took up in the House, even more frankly than in the speech of the hon. Member for Fareham. There might be on the very next occasion when they discussed the Admiralty Votes a necessity to press the Government for additional expenditure on docks and bases. He meant that they could not build big ships and alter the distribution of the Fleet without having docks and bases to meet the requirements of those big ships and the new distribution of the Fleet. Undoubtedly under the present as under the late Administration there had been an attempt to show on the part of the Board of Admiralty that a very large saving had been made in that quarter. But it was not a real saving; it was an expenditure which could not be permanently avoided. One reason why he was very anxious that we should not be extravagant now, and why he should not press the Admiralty for a too large shipbuilding programme, was because we should want money to spend upon docks and bases which this programme would require. The amount of alarm which had been displayed and would be displayed was, of course, connected with the Hague proposals and with the failure of certain Hague proposals. This Government proposed at the Hague to abolish the use of floating mines, but that proposal had been negatived by the action of Germany. That, of course, bore closely on that branch of the subject. As regarded the programme, an attack had been made on the Vote. Returns had been laid before the House this session. He had always thought it was misleading to introduce, as Mr. Goschen had done, a classification of first, second, and third class battleships into the list. That had been abandoned, and they had reverted to the first form of Return in that respect. There was another point on which the form of the Return might be improved. He had objected to the practice of putting down for all the Powers a certain number of battleships, as if thirty-two battleships were equal to twice sixteen battleships, and giving the figures at the bottom of the list independent of all other factors. They could not compare numbers with numbers; they could only go through the list and compare each with each with a certain amount of adequate knowledge. A similar objection to the new return was made which was deserving a word of remark. The hon. Member for Fareham spoke of it as a Return laid before Parliament by the Government. When Lord Tweedmouth was pressed on the subject by Lord Cawdor he replied by giving some other shorter figures. That latter Return was based on the German Return. He called particular attention to this because the German Return only took such battleships as were twenty-five years of age and under, and such cruisers as were twenty years of age and under. That Return was a Return made to the House of Lords; it was not made by the present Government; it was moved for by Lord Cawdor.

MR. ARTHUR LEE said that what the right hon. Gentleman had just told the Committee was entirely new to him and it did not appear in Lord Tweedmouth's speech.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I heard the speech.

MR. ARTHUR LEE said that in the report of Lord Tweedmouth's speech it was stated that the Return referred to the full strength of the fleets of the five great naval Powers. There was no mention of a German standard.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that Lord Cawdor in moving for the figures said he wished to have a Return in the form suggested by the speech of the First Lord, which was the German form. At all events that was the principle on which the figures were shown in the Return referred to. It was not a Government Return in its inception. None of those Returns would stand criticism. The different fleets should be compared ship by ship. It was useless to compare so many ships. They must look to the age, strength of armaments, speed, and the condition of the ships. To come to destroyers, France, for instance, at one time had an intermediate class which were not called destroyers, but high-sea torpedo boats. They would get into hopeless confusion if they counted numbers. Mere numbers were really unworthy of the consideration of the House. It was numbers which had been used by those newspapers which had attempted to create a panic. In regard to the battleship programme, he understood that some of his friends on the Ministerial side of the House were going to move a reduction of the battleship programme. He quite admitted that, as things stood at the present moment, we had an unusual superiority, to some extent due to the political accidents of the last few years, and to another extent to the policy of the Board of Admiralty in commencing the construction of "Dreadnoughts" before the other Powers had adopted either the "all-big" or the turbine principle. He should, however, resist the

Amendment, and support the Board of Admiralty as he had always done for many years, except once, because of the importance of having a continuity of shipbuilding policy. They could not in the case of the Navy afford to fluctuate from year to year. They had to look four or five years ahead in their policy, and they could not decrease battleship building below the standard which the Admiralty with the consent of the Government had fixed. He could not say whether in the case of destroyers and submarines, and even cruisers, there was ground for making the special effort which the Admiralty were contemplating for the future—far beyond this year. He would give the reasons for the faith that was in him on that subject. The hon. Member for Fareham said that there had been great delay in the programme, and that the only way in which the Government could make up for that delay was either by the immediate commencement of the whole of the ships in the programme——

MR. ARTHUR LEE said that what he had stated was that the Government had deliberately caused the delay and held out the hope of building fewer battleships according to the decision of the Hague Conference.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that it appeared to him that our predominance had increased as compared with what could be expected a year ago; and our position in respect to battleships was excellent even as compared with the time of the issue of Lord Cawdor's Memorandum. The policy which was now being followed was proclaimed by the late Government, and our relative position was better now and would be better in the future than it had been in the past. They should look ahead for the next two or three years, but he did not think there would be any falling off. He had heard with regret what the hon. Member for Fareham had said in regard to panic, although his own words were conspicuously free from panic. The hon. Member had said that we should look to the programme of Germany which was our principal rival and was the second naval Power in the world. Germany had no claim to be regarded as the second naval Power in the world. The United States was the second naval Power in the world. The hon. Gentleman smiled, but surely there could be no doubt that no comparison could be made between the fleet of Germany and the fleet of the United States. He had read all the literature on the subject as to the naval strength of all the Powers. He saw the hon. Member for Fareham smile, but by every fair test he could apply, and he was a reader of the literature of all the countries on this subject, he made the German fleet virtually unimportant, a doubtful third or fourth, but infinitely behind the second fleet of the world, which was easily that of the United States. If there was any present danger from Germany to this country, it was not the danger of invasion or from the fleet, but it was her growing superiority in the scientific equipment of her people. As regarded the cruisers and destroyers and the other classes of ships proposed in the programme he was much more doubtful. The controversy about destroyers was one with which they never would come to an agreement. The hon. Member opposite stated that there was a clear line of demarcation between torpedo-boats and destroyers, but he confessed he had been able to find no line of that kind. The use of destroyers by various Powers differed infinitely, and the sizes had always been so difficult of classification that he favoured the policy of the present Admiralty that they could not bind themselves to the use they would make of their destroyers. All the Powers were experimenting on the subject, and it was notorious that there was, at the present time, a very powerful party on the Board of Admiralty and on the Defence Committee of the Cabinet that did not believe that we were wise in spending so large an amount of our resources and in placing so large a number of our most highly-trained men in submarines and torpedo-boats in proportion to battleships as we were doing now. He viewed with suspicion the amount of energy we were throwing into submarine work, in which we were not likely to shine as compared with a certain other Power, and which was not so suitable to our particular needs. The tendency in all countries now was towards attaching more and more importance, year by year, to the battleship fleet and to concentrate attention on the fleet which would fight the battles and which, by conquering the fleet of the enemy, would clear the seas for all purposes whatever. On cruisers he was a heretic, but a heretic in good company, as one or two of our admirals were doubtful as to the need for the construction of cruisers for commerce protection. The German cruisers were, of course, the cause of the change which had been announced; but if this policy was forced upon us by the yearly building of these two fast third-class cruisers by Germany, then it seemed to him it ought to be pursued next year, if it was to be pursued at all, and not in the following year, as was suggested last night in another place by the First Lord of the Admiralty. But he doubted himself the necessity of trying to compete with these German cruisers, and when commerce destruction against us was really a thing of the past, we should be rather throwing away our money if we embarked on a large policy of commerce protection cruisers which, he feared, had been forced on the Admiralty, probably rather against their will, by outside opinion. He continued a heretic in this matter, and while he was not prepared to resist the authority on which the Admiralty might act, he would not be one to urge them to a fresh expenditure on cruisers. As to the subject of repairs, he saw no reason for supposing there was ground for alarm, but he was glad that attention should be called to it, because it was a point which needed vigilance, and on which opinion might easily be misdirected. The reserve of guns was a matter which still more needed vigilance, because, though he was not insinuating anything, there might be a tendency to save money on the things that were not seen, and as to which secrecy was necessary in the House and the country. There had been a recent increase, but that might not be sufficient, As one who was most anxious to maintain the naval position of this country, and who greatly regretted the Army Bill of this session because it would tend to the taking of money from the Navy to be spent on the Army, he supported the programme of the Government; and he would urge his hon. friends who desired a reduction in Army and Navy expenditure to turn their attention rather to the Army. No economist could doubt that in this country waste was greater in the Army, and that as far as the Fleet was concerned, as compared with other countries, we got the most for the money we spent. That being so, he would ask his hon. friends to try to make their chief demands in regard to the Army. Bearing in mind the enormous importance in naval matters of a steady policy, he should resist any reduction that might be moved.

*CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds) called attention to the strength of our Fleet and the strength of the fleets of foreign nations, as set forth in the Return which had been supplied on the Motion of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean. He said that the Secretary to the Admiralty promised in last November that the Return should give an accurate, complete, and faithful picture of the strength of the Navy. Perhaps it might do so to an expert, but he questioned whether it did so to the ordinary Member of Parliament. They ought to be able to see at a glance, not only that the two-Power standard was being maintained now, but that there was every reasonable prospect of its being maintained in the future, and that it was so to be maintained with the full knowledge and concurrence of the Board of Admiralty. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had said that numbers alone could not show anything accurately as to the relative strength of our fleet, but numbers were the only things that could be compared by non-expert Members of Parliament. Taking the two fleets of France and Germany as against our own, according to the Return we had sixty battleships, while France and Germany showed sixty-three. Was the difference there shown being redressed? We were shown as having five battleships building, while France and Germany had eighteen. Battleships were, no doubt, of different value, but the First Lord of the Admiralty had pointed out that a good way of getting at their comparative value was by taking ships fifteen years old and less. Of such ships we had forty actually built, and France and Germany thirty; but taking the battleships building also into account, we had forty-five, against the forty-eight of the other two Powers. He did not see how that was keeping up the two-Power standard, or how it absolved the Government from carrying out the programme laid down a few years ago of a minimum of four armoured ships per annum. He would have been glad if the Admiralty, in making out the Return, had seen their way to show which battleships were, in the opinion of their expert advisers, fit to be put in the line of battle. He could hardly believe that the Admiralty would say that some of the ships in their list, such as those of the "Admiral" class, the "Edinburgh," "Colossus," "Nile," and "Trafalgar," could be put in the line of battle against modern ships. He would no doubt be told that in comparing strength in battleships he ought really to bring in the armoured cruisers. Some of the latest armoured cruisers were to all intents and purposes battleships, and were fit to go into the line of battle. We had thirty-eight armoured cruisers less than fifteen years old, as against the thirty-one of France and Germany, and taking the total armoured units, both battleships and cruisers, we had at present a predominance over France and Germany of four armoured units less than fifteen years old. He agreed that that gave us the two-Power standard, but it gave nothing beyond, and he had great doubts whether that standard would be kept up by only putting three big armoured ships in the year's programme. If foreign nations reduced their building programmes in the future we could trust ourselves to build so as to keep our numbers on the same relative level as theirs, but he did not think we should be able to go below what was laid down three or four years ago as a minimum. He would now leave the question of the armoured ships and turn to the lists of protected cruisers. As regarded these it would be seen that we really had a large preponderance at the present moment of other than armoured cruisers as against the next two foreign Powers. But there was a very curious if not ominous fact emerging from these lists, and that was the fact that the only foreign European country which was building cruisers of this type was Germany. She was building three or four cruisers of 3,500 tons with 4-inch guns yearly. We must consider what should be done in the way of fighting such cruisers as other nations might put on the sea. It had always been our policy in the past to have cruisers slightly larger and more heavily armed than the cruisers they would be likely to meet. He agreed with that policy, for if we were to be certain of success in any naval action we must send out at least one cruiser which was better than the cruiser she was expected to meet, or two cruisers of equal strength in order to wipe the foreign cruiser off the sea. We could not send one and a quarter, or one and a half cruisers, and therefore we must either send out two, or one which was better than the foreign cruiser. In one speech which had been made, it was said, he thought, that the policy foreshadowed by the Secretary to the Admiralty would be an answer to Germany with her cruisers of 3,500 tons. We were to build cruisers of 3,000 tons. Were they to be the answer to Germany?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I understood the right hon. Gentleman said that the tonnage was 3,500 tons.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Yes; 3,500 tons.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Exactly the same as Germany.

*CAPTAIN HERVEY said it did not make very much difference if the tonnage was exactly the same, because to obtain a preponderance they must have two of them for the other's one. The naval view on this question of cruisers was gradually crystallising. He believed there was no room for a fighting ship between the big armoured cruiser and the big ocean-going torpedo destroyer, but these small cruisers now proposed would be useful for the purpose of showing the flag at distant foreign stations. We should have to build ships to carry out that work from time to time.

We had ships which could do it now, but these vessels were gradually becoming obsolete, and must gradually be replaced by others. He would like to know what our real policy was going to be. He did not press the right hon. Gentleman to answer, however, as to our policy in regard to these cruisers until we saw which way the cat jumped in foreign shipbuilding. He did not want useless cruisers to be laid down, but it might be necessary to build a certain number of cruisers which would be able to show the flag abroad. They could not forget what happened in Jamaica when a foreign admiral rushed to the rescue of one of our distressed Colonies and landed patrols in the chief town of the Colony. They knew how correspondence had passed which most people would have considered best kept private; but a foreign correspondent had got to work throwing about ink, and then as might be expected the fat was in the fire. If there had been one of these British cruisers on the spot she would have been most useful. It was not necessarily for fighting purposes that we wanted these ships; they could be used in protecting our interests, as in the case of the Jamaica occurrence, for instance. If a British cruiser had been there no admiral or captain of a foreign ship would have thought of landing his men unless he had first visited the English man-of-war, where he would have ascertained pretty smartly that the wish of the Governor was that no foreign seamen should be landed for the purpose of patrolling, which could be perfectly well carried out, if necessary, by the crew of the British cruiser. It was for these and similar reasons that he thought we should have sufficient ships continually being built in order to send them to different parts of the world to show the flag. As it was obvious that in war time we could not always send an armoured cruiser to watch the enemy's coast with the risk of losing an expensive vessel, it would be much better to send one of these smaller cruisers for the purpose of going along the coast to see what was going on. Therefore, there would be some use for these cruisers in time of war, but they could not be looked upon as adding to the actual fighting efficiency of the Fleet. Turning to the question of torpedo boat destroyers, a conclusion had apparently been arrived at that modern torpedo boat destroyers should be of about 800 tons, in order that they might be able to accompany the Fleets and to carry out their work wherever the enemy might be. The original type of destroyers, of which we had no less than seventy-three, was of less than 300 tons, most of them being about 270 tons. The Secretary to the Admiralty had told them that destroyers might be considered efficient as long as they were efficient—that was, he supposed, that no limit of age could be definitely stated beyond which a destroyer ought to be struck off the fighting list—but he thought that these seventy-three destroyers were rapidly becoming obsolete, if they were not already obsolete. We had, therefore, to make up a programme which would in about twelve years give us practically the same number of destroyers as we had at the present time, as the whole of the seventy-three small type destroyers were built in the four years, from 1894-97, and we should therefore have to build rather more than the ordinary average of twelve per year to keep the Fleet up to its present strength of 143. He was glad to hear the Secretary for the Admiralty state that he proposed to adopt a continuous building policy in regard to destroyers, and the twelve proposed to be built would keep them up to the proper number this year, although it would leave them still lagging behind unless the Admiralty increased that number in the future.

*MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) said the Secretary to the Admiralty concluded his speech with a reference to the Navy League. He was not a member of that League, but perhaps he might venture to express complete concurrence with the view the right hon. Gentleman had expressed about that body. With regard to the high testimony he gave the League he did not think the right hon. Gentleman could have read the resolutions submitted by both sections of the Navy League, because both condemned the Admiralty on the specific point of the Channel Fleet. The Navy League had done him the honour of consulting him in regard to their resolution refusing to agitate about the standard of naval strength, and he had given them his advice. The reason he thought they were right in not agitating about the naval strength was that the declarations of the Admiralty in the House of Lords and of the right hon. Gentleman representing the Admiralty on the Front Bench were quite satisfactory on that point. The Secretary to the Admiralty said—

> "It is the determination of the Government to maintain our naval supremacy as it is."

That statement gave them all they required. Nobody had contended either in that House or outside that our naval strength up to the present was not satisfactory. All they had contended was that a time was close at hand when we should once more have to indulge in big programmes, and it was not economical to have a small programme one year and a big one the next year as had happened under the last Liberal administration. He understood that a Resolution was going to be moved on this question by a section of the House which was an extremely Radical wing of the Liberal Party, although he did not know the name by which it was known. He did not know whether they had yet given themselves a name, but they met upstairs and they embraced the leading members of the Cobden Club. He thought the proper time for dealing with the question of battleships was when the Resolution to which he referred was moved. With regard to the Return issued by Lord Tweedmouth, the real criticism was that it only dealt with our naval strength at the present moment. Any Return on which they made up their minds as to the adequacy of the shipbuilding programme would have to include the ships in building and those projected so as to give the state of affairs in 1910 and 1911. Taking Lord Tweedmouth's classification of efficient ships now ready he gave them thirty-nine battleships as against thirty-one for the next two Powers. As the Secretary of the Admiralty had told them it was the determination of the Government to maintain the present relative strength of the Navy, they would now have that thirty-nine to thirty-one standard in order to test whether the Government were maintaining a proper naval strength. There were three projected ships this year and five now building, which made forty-seven for Great Britain as against forty-eight for the next two Powers. It was contended that in comparison with certain Powers this country was able to build much faster, but taking that proportion of thirty-nine to thirty-one of the next two Powers some day they would find that there were forty-eight for the next two Powers, with the result that Great Britain would require sixty battleships in order to maintain the same proportion as existed now, and that would leave us a very large number to build. Supposing we did not count the projected ships which the United States were laying down next year and the year after, and did not count any battleships that France intended to lay down during the same period of two years on the ground that we built faster, the Admiralty would be obliged to adopt programmes including six battleships each year before they could arrive at that standard of sixty to forty-eight to which he had alluded. The Secretary to the Admiralty divided his speech into four compartments, viz., refrigerating machinery, destroyers, cruisers, and repairs. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman was right in dealing with refrigerating machinery for the magazines first, because it was an important question and a new one. He thought the matter had been put rather too favourably by the Admiralty in regard to their lack of foresight in not introducing refrigerating machinery before. They had to remember the explosion which might have proved very disastrous which occurred on the "Fox" last October, and it was not until May of this year that the Admiralty took any action in regard to ordering refrigerating machinery. Not one penny piece for any such provision appeared in the Estimates. Then there was another consideration. For two years past the Admiralty had been in receipt of reports from ships in regard to the question of cordite. They had received report after report that whenever the temperature of magazines was high the effect on the cordite was to make shooting very erratic. That consideration ought to have warned the

Admiralty that in the interests of the efficiency of the service, apart from the danger of explosion through heat, they ought long ago to have introduced refrigerating machinery on their ships. Notwithstanding this, not a single penny had been put down for this purpose in regard to the "Dreadnought" or the "Superb" or any of the ships laid down this year. The right hon. Gentleman had informed the Committee that this machinery would cost £500,000 to fit the ships in the Navy. They had to fit up with this refrigerating machinery 160 ships afloat and eleven big ships building. He understood that the expenditure of this £500,000 was going to be spread over a period of two to three years. As it was agreed that this expenditure was urgent and necessary, he submitted that the ships ought to be fitted as soon as possible. The time at which the Admiralty had given the first order for this machinery was rather significant, for it was not given until they had had the disastrous explosions at Woolwich and at Toulon. If the efficiency of the Navy was the first consideration, the Admiralty ought long before to have given orders for supplying refrigerating machinery. This was not a new question. The Dutch Government had had refrigerating machinery for the magazines in their ships for twelve years past. The German Navy, which generally took the right course and made few mistakes, had had refrigerating machinery in their magazines and ships for six years past, and the Italian Navy introduced it two years ago. So that all those foreign navies long ago foresaw that for the sake of the efficiency of the service and avoiding dangerous explosions on board ship refrigerating machinery was necessary, and consequently they adopted it. He thought that the cost of such machinery ought to have been met by introducing a Supplementary Estimate which could have been tacked on to the Shipbuilding Vote. With regard to the question of destroyers, the Secretary to the Admiralty admitted some time back that in Germany the life of a destroyer was twelve years, and they made all their calculations upon that assumption. Germany was now building twelve destroyers a year as compared with our two for last year and five for this year. In justifying the building of so few destroyers the right hon. Gentleman said that the number to be built depended upon the use to be made of them from time to time. As it took eighteen months to build a destroyer, it was obvious that the Admiralty could not quite foresee what particular use they would be putting destroyers to eighteen months hence, and the only course to take was to follow the old plan of having a sufficiency of them in building. In all their shipbuilding in the past they had shown extraordinary instability of policy. He found that seventy-nine destroyers were laid down in the three years 1894 to 1896. In the last three years, from 1905 to 1907, they had only provided eleven, or less than one-seventh of the number provided in the period he had mentioned, and at the time those eleven were being built seventy-nine were falling obsolete. It was the same with all classes of shipbuilding, and in our programme there was nothing like the consistency shown in the German programme. In regard to armoured vessels, they built fourteen in 1899 and three this year. He thought that next year hon. Members would find that the number would shoot up again. That was the reason why he objected to a small building programme now. In 1889 and 1890 they laid down thirty-six unarmoured cruisers, as compared with none for 1905 and 1906. Of course it was monstrous to lay down thirty-six cruisers in two years. It simply meant that in fifteen years these cruisers would have shaken themselves to pieces and would no longer be fit for repair. They would be obsolete altogether. This year they were going to lay down one. From Answers given to Questions in the House it appeared that by next year we should have seventy-one destroyers, including building and projected, less than twelve years old, and which would be reckoned by the Germans as efficient destroyers. During the same period the Germans would have seventy-three efficient destroyers, or two more than we should have. The Germans were going to lay down twelve more next year, and that would make eighty-five, so that our next year's programme would require to have fourteen destroyers in order to attain equality with the Germans. But there were obvious reasons why we should have a great superiority over any two nations in destroyers, whereas he had merely compared our strength with one nation. In time of war we should require to have at least one-third of the destroyers away from the Fleet refitting. We should be compelled to carry out the policy which Japan pursued in blockading the enemy's coasts, and we must have a superiority of one-third over the enemy whose coasts were blockaded. We had had forty-seven destroyers stationed abroad in 1906. The reason for that was that destroyers could not be sent out conveniently after a war had broken out; the stations abroad had to be provided beforehand in time of peace with the destroyers which might be required. The Secretary to the Admiralty had next dealt with cruisers. Lord Tweedmouth's Return, which had been referred to, adding in the ships building, gave the strength of our fleet in efficient armed cruisers at thirty-eight, and that of the next two Powers at thirty-seven, being a superiority of one. That was nothing like the superiority of two to one which had often existed in the past. There was one significant omission from Lord Tweedmouth's Return. He omitted all other types of cruisers. When the Admiralty were asked for evidence to be placed before the Royal Commission on Food Supplies they sent a letter dated 2nd July, 1904, in which they stated that if the enemy's cruisers escaped—

> "We could always spare a superior number of vessels to follow them."

If there was an insufficient number of cruisers to protect our commerce in time of war, there would be a public demand in this country, and especially on the part of business men in London, to detach armoured cruisers from the fleets in order to pursue the little German cruisers which could go twenty-four knots an hour. It would be a tremendous waste of power to detach a 17,000 ton cruiser to go after a little 3,000 ton German cruiser. The admirals in charge of the fleets would resist that demand. They would not part with their armoured cruisers if they could possibly help it. There was the best evidence of that in the policy of the Japanese commanders in the battle of Tsushima. Incidentally he might mention that both nations in that war sacrificed their commerce. This we could not possibly do. In order to have the armoured cruisers in the battle the Japanese used small cruisers for scouting purposes. Their tactics were absolutely justified by the fact that the battle was determined within an hour of the beginning of the fight. If the armoured cruisers had been sent away to protect commerce or to scout they could not have returned to Tsushima. During the last seven years the wastage of protected cruisers in our Fleet had been at the rate of six a year, while we had only built one a year. There was inconsistency about the Admiralty policy in the fact that though they said that the best of the protected cruisers would die out in a few years, and this was said in "A Statement of Admiralty Policy" issued two years ago, seven were to have £241,000 spent upon them for repairs this year. He did not find fault with this; he only called attention to the fact when it was alleged that the responsible advisers of the Admiralty never made mistakes. He found also in the Return of fleets that there was a total of eighty-two protected cruisers given. But an analysis showed that twelve of them were on the sale list, and from other causes, such as the ships being in special reserve as a preliminary to passing to the sale list, the total was finally reduced to fifty-seven. Against any two Powers that number gave us no superiority whatever in protected cruisers, whereas it had always been contended that in this respect we should have a great superiority. Sixteen of our protected cruisers were over twenty knots at their trials, and they were older than those of the Germans. The Germans, on the other hand, had built, or were building, twenty-eight of over twenty knots. The Admiralty account of the naval manœuvres last year claimed that our superiority in armoured cruisers for the protection of commerce was greater than we really possessed against any two Powers. In armoured cruisers they gave the English force sixteen to eight of the enemy. He maintained that we did not possess that superiority. The proportions in big unarmoured cruisers were eleven to one, small cruisers were twenty-two to eight, and destroyers were thirty-eight to thirty-one. We had in all fifty-one cruisers and scouts to seventeen, or three to one. He had shown that we possessed nothing like that superiority, and yet the Admiralty had the audacity, when they issued their Report, to state that in these manœuvres they were trying the risks to British shipping under the most unfavourable conditions conceivable when in addition to giving the English fleet an overwhelming preponderance they confined the manœuvres to a narrow belt of 900 miles stretching to Gibraltar so that the English ships knew exactly when to look for the enemy. The right hon. Gentleman had given far too favourable a view of the position in regard to cruisers being built on the financial side. If the figures in the Navy Estimates which gave the number of cruisers on the stocks for any one year were looked at they would find that in 1903–4 there were thirty-nine cruisers and scouts on the stocks; in 1904–5, thirty-eight; in 1905–6 twenty-eight; in 1906–7 seven, excluding three "Incincibles;" and in 1907–8 there were only four again, excluding the three "Invincibles" which ought to be regarded as battleships. There would come a time when there would be only one cruiser on the stocks at all unless the Admiralty carried out their intention to lay down more cruisers. The next point with which his right hon. friend dealt was repairs. He had given the Committee a very rosy picture of those repairs, and he was perfectly correct in saying that it was not a question of one Party or another. If anything, he believed that the present Government were devoting more attention to repairs than the last Government did in 1905. In 1905–6 a great fault was found with the way in which the repair work was being done. In the First Lord's Memorandum it was stated that in the third week of January, 1904, out of sixty battleships, thirty-eight were unavailable, owing to the need of repairs, or 63 per cent. of the whole, and that on January 21st, 1907, out of fifty-one battleships only eight, or 16 per cent., were unavailable. It was very easy to upset these statements by statistics. The Admiralty said that these battleships were "unavailable owing to the need of repairs"; but in a letter to him from Lord Tweedmouth it was explained that the Admiralty took the official Returns from the number of the vessels actually under repair in the dockyards; so that, if no vessels had been taken in hand at all, it would have been possible to say that none were unavailable owing to need of repairs. That was the way in which the Admiralty used statistics to hoax the House of Commons. There was another fault to be found with statistics. In the first place they were told that in 1904 there were sixty battleships, but all obsolete vessels were included. In 1906 the Dilke Return gave us sixty-one battleships, but in this Return of the same date only fifty-one battleships were mentioned. For strength statistics they included ten obsolete battleships, but for repair statistics they excluded them as their inclusion would mar their figures. It was not quite an honest way of dealing with the question, and tended to destroy all trust in Admiralty statistics. Then in the list of battleships needing repairs in 1904 the "Monarch," which was a depot ship and not a fighting ship at all, and the "Hotspur," which never was a battleship but an obsolete coast defence vessel, were included so as to swell the number of battleships needing repairs. He could vouch for these facts, as the list was furnished to him from the First Lord himself, and if it were necessary to pursue his criticisms he could point to a number of other circumstances with which the Admiralty were perfectly familiar which made the comparison grossly unfair. It was a little bit dishonest to present statistics of this kind, and he thought that someone should be censured for handing such statistics to the Admiralty. To prove his point, a Return which excluded from the ships needing repairs the "Goliath" and the "Canopus," on which £48,000 and £25,000 were now to be spent, was not quite a scrupulous and straightforward statement.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) thought that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty would admit that he was one of those who had never wished by speech or vote to make a case against the Admiralty. He sincerely desired that no case would ever be made against them. He had learned to feel the greatest possible confidence in the distinguished officers who were charged with maintaining the preparedness of the Navy for war; and he would wish that from all which the right hon. Gentleman had said that afternoon, it could be wholly maintained that there was no weak joint in the armour of the Admiralty. His only wish was to ascertain what were the facts. There were points which urgently required attention which had not been discussed that afternoon, and on which the policy of the Admiralty would have to be challenged. In the question of bases, for instance, the policy of the Admiralty was not dictated by naval considerations. In regard to this Vote, the right hon. Gentleman had made a most interesting and to a large extent a re-assuring statement. It was very difficult even for those who, like himself, had made a very close and constant study of the details of our naval work, to take issue, if they desired it, with the representatives of the Admiralty in regard to this question of repairs. The question of the building programme was in a different position. He felt that the hon. Member for King's Lynn had made a speech which was of real value, and without committing himself to all that the hon. Gentleman had said it was evident that if the Admiralty did not take steps which had not yet been foreshadowed, a very serious state of things would arise. He understood from the Secretary to the Admiralty that they felt that the time had come when the question of somewhat enlarging the building programme should be considered, and they had the promise of the right hon. Gentleman that next year would see a revival of the building of the cruiser class. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken, not in heat, but with a perfect calm which was greatly appreciated by the House. He had complained of the very many Questions which had been addressed to him, and said that it was not quite fair to be thus taken to task; but on this point the late and the present Admiralty might cry quits. Although the Questions addressed to the right hon. Gentleman had been somewhat unpalatable, if too much information had been asked for, a great deal too little had been given. Great as was his real and genuine confidence in the administration of the Admiralty at the present time, he believed that there was a danger in that. He himself had held his hand absolutely during the past two years in regard to all Admiralty matters; but in the course of the last few months he had heard many men, who like himself were favourably disposed to the Admiralty, express their concern and suspicion with regard to the policy of the Board. He did not desire to say that in all cases these men had convinced him that the grounds of their anxiety were fully justified by the facts; but he must say that, apart from any sensational speaking or writing—and too much had been made of it—there was a growing feeling of anxiety. There had been not only an unfortunate reticence in the answering of Questions, but a continuance of that unfortunate policy of surreptitious *communiqués* to the Press. He was altogether opposed to the plan of making what had been put into the mouths of private persons by the Admiralty appear as if it were an independent expression of public opinion, and he thought that that policy was full of mischief, that it should cease, and that any communication the Admiralty had to make should be made through its representatives in Parliament. He also thought that the greatest care should be taken that the information given to Parliament in regard to naval affairs was stricty accurate. In order that the alarm which was entertained that the repairs of the Fleet had fallen off might be set at rest a Question on the subject was asked in another place; and, in reply, the First Lord of the Admiralty stated that the repairs for the year for which he was responsible compared favourably with the repairs of any previous year. But he happened to know that it would be just as reasonable to include the old float at Chatham docks as some of the ships that were included in that comparison as undergoing repairs. The British people would believe almost anything it was told in regard to naval and military matters; and special care ought to be taken that this touching confidence was not abused. He undertook to say that four years ago enormous sums were spent on repairs, with the result that the Navy was then in a better state of repair than it had been for many a long year. He regretted there had been a reversal of policy in this respect. When he was at the Admiralty it was decided, on the recommendation of a strong committee of experts, of which he was a member, to send the ships to the great contract yards to be repaired under commercial conditions. That admirable plan had been discontinued on the ground of expense, and the ships were now to be repaired in the dockyards; but when he saw that the workmen employed in the dockyards were being diminished by thousands he asked how it was possible to carry on the repairs of the Navy in the dockyards as they ought to be carried on. He was not personally acquainted with the facts, but he was told by a very large number of persons, whom he believed to be impartial and knew to be well-informed, that repairing work had fallen greatly into arrears, and that there were many ships which, if ordered to go on a long cruise, and certainly to undertake the arduous duties of a campaign, would be found to be insufficient in their repairs. He thought when they were told, in defence of the stoppage in the building of small cruisers, that these vessels could now serve no good purpose in war, a large demand was being made on their credulity. They could not believe that the great naval Power which was building a large number of these vessels was absolutely wrong in its policy; and in his view if we relied on large cruisers to be detached to pursue and capture these smaller vessels we were allowing a danger to exist against which we had no adequate protection. With regard to the £200,000 which it was proposed to spend this year on the refrigerating apparatus for cordite, he desired to know how the money was exactly to be provided for out of the existing Votes. They would criticise very closely next year the absence of a Supplementary Estimate. He hoped that the House would be asked for one, and if it were for £500,000 they would take a very generous view of an expenditure of this character for the preservation of the magazines and the safety of the lives of the sailors on our ships.

The CIVIL LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) said the reason why the sum for refrigerating apparatus in the magazines was not placed in the Estimates was that the Estimates were framed before the Admiralty had made up their mind what they could do in the matter. The right hon. Gentleman asked why had not more than £200,000 been spent this year; the reason was that they could not spend economically and efficiently more than that sum. A considerable amount of apparatus had to be ordered. They were proceeding as rapidly as was desirable. The right hon. Gentleman had made a statement which was somewhat new to him, that the repair of ships by contract was an economical method of procedure.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he did not say that; he said it was reported to be abandoned now because it was believed to be expensive.

Mr. LAMBERT said he had more than once made very careful inquiries into this matter, and he understood that the experiment of repairing ships by contract was not economical. The right hon. Gentleman said that a considerable amount of unrest existed in the public mind with regard to repairs. He did not think, however, that the Admiralty could possibly be more explicit than his right hon. friend had been that afternoon. The hon. Member for Fareham had said that in 1903–4 some £3,169,000 was spent on repairs. That was true; but that was during the time when these repairs were done by contract, an expensive method, which had not commended itself to the Admiralty. He found it very difficult to say anything about these repairs, because the Estimates of right hon. Gentlemen opposite in regard to the repairs did not err on the side of parsimony. In 1905–6 they estimated £2,000,000 and spent £1,500,000. The Estimates the Government took over last January twelvemonth they did not alter in the slightest degree. Those estimates provided for £1,628,100 to be spent on repairs, and, as his right hon. friend stated, they were not satisfied with that and spent £282,000 more. Surely that must satisfy hon. Gentlemen opposite, at any rate, that they were keeping up the repairs of the fleet so far as spending money was concerned. The most extraordinary statements had appeared in the Press in some quarters. He would have thought more care would have been taken to obtain accurate statements. There appeared in a London paper yesterday morning a list of the ships in repair, and a more inaccurate list never found its way into a public print. It contained the following among other allegations in regard to the Home Fleet:—

> "Out of thirteen battleships five are unavailable for active service."

There were only two in repair, not five.

> "Out of thirty cruisers nineteen are unavailable."

The number was four, not nineteen.

> "Out of 120 destroyers forty-seven are unavailable."

The figure should be nineteen, not forty-seven. It was too ridiculous. This paper purported to give the repairs of the various ships belonging to the Home Fleet. He would take the cruisers. The "Amphitrite" was said to be "defective owing to continued neglect." Here was the official report—

> "A thorough refit at Chatham has just been completed, and the ship is now efficient in all respects."

This was the statement in the Press as to the "Ariadne"—

> "Repairs have accumulated, and it is doubtful if she could make 15 knots."

The official report said—

> "Has just completed a thorough refit at Portsmouth, and is in all respects in efficient condition. On her recent trials she steamed 20·8 knots for eight hours, trials being in all respects satisfactory."

No wonder the public mind—if it took any notice of these things—was a little discomposed.

MR. MARKHAM: Will the hon Gentleman give us the name of the paper.

MR. LAMBERT said the "Diadem" was stated to be "defective owing to continued neglect." The official report was—

> "In serviceable condition. Steams well. She is in the Chatham programme for general refit this financial year. Preparatory work is in progress at Chatham."

Of the "Donegal" it was said—

> "Grounded badly in 1906 manœuvres; it is doubtful if she is sound."

The defects were due to grounding in the Red Sea, not in the manœuvres, and they had been thoroughly dealt with at Chatham. There was no doubt she was quite sound and perfectly efficient in all respects. Of the "Doris," it was stated in the Press, "leaks badly." The official report was—

> "Thoroughly sound and does not leak."

[Cries of "What paper?"] He did not care to advertise it. He had a long list.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is very important.

MR. LAMBERT said the "Niobe" was reported to be "defective owing to continual neglect." The official report was—

> "Is in serviceable condition; will be thoroughly examined later in the year to ascertain when she will require to be refitted."

Of the "Warrior" it was said, "New cruiser, Nore division, unfinished." She was complete; anything remaining to be done was of minor importance. He could go through the destroyers in the same way. The Admiralty had nothing to conceal in the matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that, as far as he knew, the whole disquiet of the public mind related to repairs, and did not relate to what he might call the fundamentals of the shipbuilding programme. It was because they had not yet had the precise statements upon these repairs that disquiet continued. He was convinced it would be brought to an end if the Admiralty would on their authority state with regard to each ship criticised whether the criticism was accurate or not. The hon Gentleman would not weary the House.

MR. LAMBERT said he would go right through the list if desired, but it was a very long one. [Cries of "Print it."]

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he would consider the question of printing it.

MR. LAMBERT, referring to the "Canopus," said that in the 1906 manœuvres her air pumps gave trouble; she was sent to Portsmouth, and the defect made good. She was now with the Home Fleet and was in full serviceable condition. She was thoroughly refitted in 1904, and would be taken in hand again in November next for general refit, to be ready by the end of March. This ship was referred to in the paper in question as "quite unfit for continuous service." Of course ships needed repair now and again, and the policy of the late and the present Board of Admiralty had been that the whole of the ships should not come in at once. The policy, as he understood it, was that the commanders-in-chief of the fleets should send in, six months before a ship required refit, a statement of the general state of the vessel in order that preparations might be made for taking her in hand. He could state that on the authority of the Admiralty itself. He did not like to single out individual officers of the Admiralty, but one of them, almost in despair on the previous day said to him, "It seems no good what we say; they will not believe us." Therefore, on the question of repairs, that was as far as he could go, at present at any rate. He had been asked what was the difference between an extended refit and an annual refit. The annual refit was limited to about forty days; an extended refit took from three to nine months, depending on the condition of the vessel. If a ship had been injured the refit might take longer than the period he had named. Then he had been asked how many "Dreadnoughts" had been laid down by Germany. Up to May last, none.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: But how many since May?

MR. LAMBERT: I am giving the information at the Admiralty up to the end of May.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Have you no later information?

MR. LAMBERT replied that he had no later information with him; that was all the information furnished. As to the question put by the right hon. Gentleman the House might depend upon it that the official advisers of the Admiralty were well aware of foreign shipbuilding programmes, and they were well aware of our necessities, and they could be relied upon to advise the Government as to the best methods of spending money on the various classes of ships to be built. They had the number of destroyers, but, of course, these figures must be considered according to the individual judgment of each person. In the Return issued on the Motion of his right hon. riend the Member for the Forest of Dean the list of ships was given. Of course, the Admiralty did not profess to estimate what was the relative value of the ships; they gave the list, and it was for individuals to form their own conclusions; but he must say that in this matter the First Lord of the Admiralty had endeavoured to give the very fullest information as regarded the relative strength of the battle fleets of the world.

MR. ARTHUR LEE asked what steps the Admiralty proposed to take with regard to the second inducement held out to the Hague Conference, and which had caused the shipbuilding programme of this year to be introduced at an abnormally late date.

MR. LAMBERT: The policy of the Admiralty with regard to laying down two armoured ships and reserving the third until the result of the Hague Conference becomes known is not changed. I think that was made explicit and clear by the First Lord of the Admiralty's statement, issued at the beginning of the session, and there has been no change at all in that programme.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: I think the hon. Gentleman has misunderstood my question. I am not referring to the question of laying down or not laying down a third ship. The Secretary to the Admiralty last year, in referring to the amount to be taken for new vessels in 1907–8, said the shipbuilding programme was introduced at a late period in order to emphasise the good faith of the British Government in desiring to bring about a reduction of armaments.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON was understood to deny that he had used words of that character.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Here are your own words about holding out an inducement to the other Powers.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I do not remember them.

*MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said he desired to move the reduction of the Vote by £100 in order to say a few words in regard to the specific grievance of a large section employed in the right hon. Gentleman's department. Though the question might seem to be somewhat small compared with that they had been discussing, yet to the Iron and Steel Shipbuilders and Boilermakers Society it was one of extreme importance. Last year in discussing some of the Estimates, the Government were good enough in regard to a large section of the men employed in the dockyards to give their claims careful consideration, with the result that something like £60,000 had been paid this year in increased wages, a fact on which he complimented them. He only hoped that what was done last year would not be used as an argument against doing something for the men for whom he was now speaking. The principal point of contention was this. The Government at the present time trained men and called them skilled labourers; but these men were doing skilled work, and therefore they ought to receive skilled men's pay. They were paid the wage between a labourer's and a skilled workman's, and the result was that to-day skilled work was being done in the dockyards at a rate which was considerably less than was paid in private yards, though the work in each instance was the same. The men in the dockyards compared with the men in the private yards were not fairly treated. In the principal shipyards up and down the country there were wages boards, upon which the men were equally represented with the employers, and all the points were dealt with, and the men were at full liberty to discuss the different issues. But in the dockyards the men had no say whatever in regard to any arrangement so far as wages were concerned, and the result was that at the present time wages in the dockyards for these men to whom he referred were 40 per cent. less than were being paid in the principal shipbuilding centres of the country. In private yards at the present time, a man who had finished his apprenticeship immediately received pay which was 25 per cent. higher than was paid in the dockyards. If they took the Tyne, the Clyde, the Mersey, the Thames, and the Barrow they would find that the platers' wages averaged 38s. 3d. per week; riveters, 34s. 9d.; and holders-up, 28s. 3d. a week. When they came to the Government dockyards they found that the maximum pay of the platers was 28s.; holders-up, 25s.; riveters, 28s.; the difference as regarded platers' wages was 10s. 3d., riveters, 6s. 9d.; and holders-up, 3s. 3d. per week. It would be asked by the Government whether these men were sufficiently skilled to do this work. If, as the Government argued, these trained men were sufficiently skilled to do the work—and they did do the work equally with skilled men—then it was unfair on the part of the Government to pay them a less wage than was paid to others working in private yards and who were doing precisely the same kind of work. Was it to be supposed that the employers outside would continue to pay difference in wages of 10s., 6s., and 5s. every week when the Government were paying these lower wages for the same kind of work in the dockyards? He was afraid they would not continue to do it long if the Government still retained the existing rate of wages. There had been a conference between representatives of the men and the Government Departments, but no satisfactory solution had been arrived at. Workers under the Government were supposed to have pensions, yet it was admitted by the Admiralty that less than 25 per cent. of the men were on the permanent list, and the other 75 per cent. were not entitled to pensions. Those who were entitled to pension had deducted from their wages every week 6d. for every 10s. they earned, and if they died before they reached the pension age the widows and families did not receive any recompense. In regard to the 75 per cent. not entitled to pension there was considerable room for improvement. The fact that pensions were given to Government *employés* was often urged as a reason for not giving the same rate of wages as was paid outside, but when they found that 75 per cent. were not entitled to pension, and that those who were entitled, if they did not reach the pensionable age, left behind them widows and families who got nothing, then the argument which was urged about pensions lost a great deal of its force. What he urged was that the Government should pay the same rate of wages as was paid outside by private employers for the same class of work, for the Government ought not to pay less, because that was a bad example, and they ought to set a good example as employers of labour. To-day they were setting a very bad one, at all events as regarded the class of men to whom he referred. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would give some promise in reference to the matter; if he did not he was afraid that they would have to go to a division. He hoped that the Secretary to the Admiralty would give an opportunity to the representatives of the Iron and Steel Shipbuilders and Boilermakers Society to meet representatives of the Government to discuss these matters, with a view to changes being made which would prove satisfactory to both sides. He was only asking for that which was fair in asking the Government to do that.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,800, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Summerbell.*)

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that last year the Admiralty began a new system of dealing with the dockyards which he thought had worked successfully. The Board of Admiralty visited the various yards once a year, and every considerable section of the men was allowed to send two representatives to state their grievances, in the absence of their local superiors, before the Lords of the Admiralty. Moreover, the men had been permitted to send as one of their representatives a man who was not a member of their own grade, and they were, therefore, able to be represented by men of the class the hon. Member desired to come before the Board. Three hon. Members below the gangway opposite had represented the men on these occasions, and in one case they were represented by a lawyer. The Board had no reason to regret the change, and they hoped this plan would remove questions of labour from the arena of the House of Commons. The Admiralty had also established an informal board for the consideration of trade questions, and especially of disputes between one trade and another. The petitions this year were all in, and they were under consideration, and he could assure the hon. Member that what he had said would not be lost sight of.

Mr. JENKINS (Chatham) called attention to the fact that in 1906 when introducing the Navy Estimates the right hon. Gentleman accepted a Resolution in favour of allowing an accredited representative of the men to accompany the representative of the trade in the dockyard when petitions were presented, and of granting the recognised trade union rate of wages as paid in the district where similar work was done. So far as the first part of the promise was concerned, it had been faithfully carried out, and he wished to thank the Admiralty for the kindness and courtesy shown to their deputations. He wished to know what had been done in reference to the other part of the promise. It was perfectly true that last year the Admiralty issued a statement after the petitions had been presented, and a concession of about £60,000 per annum was made to the workmen. That showed plainly that for a great many years the workmen in the dockyards had been labouring under a great disadvantage. That £60,000 meant about 1s. per week to the whole of the workmen and a certain amount to the officials. But even with this additional payment the rate of wages paid was not the same as was paid in other parts of the country where similar work was done. That was just the grievance they complained of, and they had laid it before the Admiralty when the representatives of the dockyard men presented their petitions. He had spoken upon this question to the workmen employed in every dockyard in the country, and the difficulty was to find out the average rate of wages paid. He wished the Secretary to the Admiralty to realise that the Resolution confined itself strictly to the wages paid in the district where the Government work was done. He had gone carefully through the whole of the Estimates, and he found that ten armoured cruisers were being built or nearing completion outside the Royal dockyards. One was being built at Chatham, one on the Tyne, four on the Clyde, one at Barrow-in-Furness, and one at Sunderland. The men were quite prepared to strike an average wage for all those ports, but what did the Admiralty do? They referred them to the Board of Trade Return, in which as far as his own trade was concerned they took into consideration ninety-four ports. He wished to point out that five-sixths of those ports never did Government work at all. As far as his society was concerned they did present to the Admiralty a Return in which they took nine ports in 1906, namely the Thames, the Mersey, the Tyne, the Clyde, Barrow, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Sunderland, and Belfast, and they included the hours worked in both summer and winter, and the wages paid on new and old work. The average hours for those ports were fifty-three per week in the winter and forty-nine and a half in the summer, making an average all the year round of fifty-one and a half hours, and the average wage worked out at £1 19s. 10d. per week. He agreed that when they compared the number of hours worked in the Government dockyards with those outside there was a difference. The hours worked in the Government dockyards were forty-eight per week. On that occasion the Government took credit for being model employers, and for shortening the hours of labour from fifty-one and a half to forty-eight. They did not increase wages. He would place before the Committee the average weekly hours for the nine ports when the working hours were fifty-one and a half. The average weekly wage was £1 19s. 10d. whereas in the nine ports when forty-eight hours were worked the average week's wage was £1 17s. In the dockyards, the men in his trade, because of the shipping advance given last year, got £1 15s. 6d. for forty-eight hours work, and that notwithstanding the fact that the Admiralty had added £60,000 a year to the amount paid in wages. That difference of 1s. 6d. was manifestly unfair. What applied to his own trade applied also to others. He wished to say a word or two on behalf of the ordinary labourers in the dockyards. It was true that they received an advance of wages of 1s., but he was addressing a House which only a few hours ago voted £50,000 to one individual. The labourers in the dockyards for forty-eight hours per week received £1 1s. He knew that there were economists in the House, and if he were pleading for the building of a new ship he might be met with arguments on the score of economy, but he was appealing on behalf of men who were in receipt of 21s. a week. He and his friends would not be satisfied till the minimum wage for those men was not less than 24s., and he hoped the day would soon come when it would be recognised that that was not too much for a living wage to those people. As to skilled work, the Government must recognise that they were committed by the acceptance of the Resolution of last year to pay the same rate in the dockyards as was paid by private firms. What did riveters and caulkers get in the dockyards? Only 5 per cent. of the men realised the maximum of 28s. per week, 10 per cent. got 27s., 15 per cent. 26s., 20 per cent. 25s., fifteen per cent. 24s., 10 per cent. 23s., and 5 per cent. 22s. The average pay for the skilled worker was only 25s. per week. He asked the Admiralty whether they were prepared to pay to riveters and caulkers the same wages as men received in outside establishments? He trusted the Admiralty would be generous enough to consider this matter. There were 25,000 men in the Royal dockyards, thoroughly equipped and fit to do great service for the country, for they were the constructors of the first line of defence. While he thanked the Admiralty for the concessions already made, he had to state that unless a pledge was given that the men in the dockyards would receive trade union rates he and his friends would go to a division.

SIR JOHN BENN (Devonport) said he was a little afraid, after the speech of his hon. friend, that the Admiralty might form the impression that those who represented dockyard constituencies were not sufficiently appreciative of what had been done. He would endeavour to state the views of those interested in this matter as to the admirable way in which the new system had worked. There was now ample opportunity for the valuable speeches which had been addressed to the Committee by Labour Members being repeated by the hon. Gentlemen themselves in presence of the Lords of the Admiralty. A tribunal had at last been established which gave full opportunity for the men to state their claims. Eighteen months ago the only opportunity the men had for stating their grievances was by the old-fashioned method of sending in petitions, and occasionally they had the opportunity of seeing the authorities. Under the new system a round table conference had been set up, and the Lords of the Admiralty, at great inconvenience to themselves, had gone from dockyard to dockyard, and had invited the men to meet them. They had given the men the opportunity of being represented by trade union leaders. He thought that was a satisfactory state of things. Up to the present time a great deal had been done in the direction desired, and 300 representatives of the workmen had been received by the Lords of the Admiralty. Shorthand notes were taken of the evidence of those who could speak with authority on these matters. Up to the present time £60,000 a year had been added to the wages of those employed in the dockyards. He regarded that fact with great satisfaction, because hitherto the position of a dockyard Member had been looked upon with suspicion. They had been compelled to state in the House that the men were underpaid, and it had been said by some that it was for political reasons they pleaded for better wages for the men. To-day they were able to say that the claims which had been brought forward year after year had been amply justified by the inquiries held by the Lords of the Admiralty. They were extremely glad that a tribunal now existed by which something had been done in the direction they wished. The work was not finished, but an excellent beginning had been made. An attitude of criticism at this juncture was the best to adopt. He knew that the Government intended to fulfil the pledge, which they gave without hesitation, that the workers in the dockyards should enjoy wages comparable with trade union wages paid outside. When further representations were made in regard to these matters he was confident that they would receive sympathetic consideration, and that by another year they would see a further levelling up. Lord Tweedmouth in his Memorandum stated that it was not the intention of the Admiralty to allow overtime to be worked in the dockyards. He regarded that statement with satisfaction, because it was better that more hands should be employed than that overtime should be paid to a smaller number. On the question of discharges, he had reason to be grateful to the Government. Since the Government came into office 171 more men were employed in the dockyards, and that was a matter for congratulation. It was of great importance that in the matter of work the claims of the dockyards should receive first attention. He was not against private yards getting Government work, but he felt that unless the Government had national workshops fully equipped such work as was desired could not be produced. The public dockyards were not able to compete with the private dockyards, and, if in times of peace a dockyard was starved out, those who were engaged in it would have no opportunity of getting work in other directions. The First Lord of the Admiralty in his Memorandum said that under the change in the dockyard system the business was working smoothly and well, and he thought the nation might be satisfied that its dockyard work was going on satisfactorily. He had the fullest sympathy with the position taken up by his hon. friends on the other side of the House.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfrairs) said that he wished to say a word or two in reply to what the Secretary to the Admiralty had said as to their competence to bring forward and discuss this question on the floor of the House. He thought they should reserve their rights to come there as to a Court of Appeal. A particular class of men had had an opportunity of meeting the Board of Admiralty, and they now asked that the representatives of the Board should give them some assurance that the particular case which they had mentioned would not be taken as one among a multitude of questions which would form the subject of investigation by those who were experts in these matters. They would like to meet not the Lords of the Admiralty but men who had special and detailed knowledge. It was perfectly true that there had been an increase of wages in the dockyards at home, but he was sorry to say that did not apply to our dockyards abroad, and he thought the concessions which had been made at home should be extended abroad, where the men worked for longer hours and under climatic conditions which did not prevail here. He thought the Government ought to give them some assurance on that point.

MR. VIVIAN (Birkenhead) said he had heard the case powerfully put for the Royal dockyards, but he rose to put the case for the private dockyards. He was not in favour of encouraging the extension of the Royal dockyards, because an immense amount of capital expenditure in regard to machinery and plant was made when war was threatened or took place, but when the war was over or the threatened war passed over, the machinery and the officialdom went on. Labour felt the blow at once, while the more prosperous employees did not. In private yards, however, the labour was more easily utilised for other work, and when war was over he had known cases in which ninety per cent. of the staff were suddenly engaged in producing things which were useful in time of peace. He would rather see an increase of private dockyards than of Royal dockyards. It was impossible to fulfil those conditions by utilising private yards except on a very reasonable scale and under proper regulations. The endeavour of the Admiralty should be to organise the resources of the country for the purpose of producing ships and other things required in war, so that in times of excitement and national danger the means of production should expand with the greatest rapidity and least waste. This could not be done by utilising the Royal yards on a very large scale, but by utilising the private yards their equipment would be encouraged, and the purposes of the Admiralty would be served without the waste that followed the fluctuations in the employment of labour in the Royal dockyards. There was one other defence of the private yards which he wished to point out. He was pleased to learn from his hon. friends below the gangway that they were now endeavouring, and he hoped they would succeed, to bring the wages of those engaged in State employment up to the standard which had been paid in private yards for many years. In that endeavour he would do everything in his power to help them. One hon. Member had said that there was a difference of twenty-five per cent. in the wages paid in the Royal dockyards and those paid in private yards. If that were so, he did not know why the men should be so enthusiastic in favour of employment in State yards.

MR. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham) said he doubted whether the Members for the dockyard constituencies shared the opinion of hon. Members who were in favour of an unlimited expansion of the public dockyards. What was wanted was not violent expansion at one moment to be followed by depression at another. As a dockyard Member himself what he asked for was that the Government work should be so arranged that, as far as possible, the employment in the State dockyards should be constant, and that the number of men always the same year after year. Such a policy had not been so fairly carried out as it might have been in recent years. The Admiralty deserved thanks for the opportunity they had given to the men to make their grievances known directly, but he agreed that that did not relieve Members who represented dockyard constituencies of their right and duty to press in the House upon the Ministry the fair claims of their constituents. He thought the Motion made to day was amply justified, at all events from a constitutional point of view. He, however, would ask the hon. Member for Sunderland not to press his Amendment. He thought it would be acknowledged that no Government had shown itself more sensible to or sympathetic with the claims of labour than the present Government. A great advance in the treatment of the men employed in the dockyards had been made, and they were assured that the representations and complaints lodged with the Board of Admiralty at the beginning of the year were receiving serious and sympathetic consideration. If that were so, he doubted whether it would be altogether grateful or graceful to press the consideration of particular items further at the present time. There were some men in whom he was interested to whom he desired to refer. He meant the caulkers, of whom he believed that they were only eighty in England.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley): Nonsense; there are hundreds of them.

MR. NAPIER said he was told that those men had had only 1s. advance in their wages during the last thirty-four years. If that were so, it required serious consideration. He hoped that his right hon. friend would make a note of the word "caulkers," and that when he returned to his office he would inquire into their case. He would suggest that the Motion had served a useful purpose in drawing the attention of the House to the condition of the men and their wages, and he hoped that his hon. friend would not press it to a division, but leave the matter open for another year for the consideration of Ministers, when he was sure it would be found that the grievance complained of would be remedied.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth) said he wished to express great regret that the hon. Member for Birkenhead should have raised on that occasion the question of private *versus* Royal dockyards. It was not suggested in any way by the dockyard Members, but as the hon. Member had raised the point he wanted to put one fact before the Committee which would speak volumes in answer to the allegations that had been made. In the earlier part of the debate they were informed that during the nine months prior to 1st January, 1906, something like 6,733 men were discharged from the Royal dockyards. The House would easily understand the great trouble and tribulation that arose in the dockyard towns, which were different from other towns, and the loss to their commercial life that resulted on account of these numerous discharges. They were prevented from having commercial docks in these places, and were consequently practically without commerce, and the result was a state of things that did not occur in towns where private and commercial yards existed. He therefore thought the suggestion made by the hon. Member was a very unfortunate one, and personally he regretted it very much. His object in rising, however, was to say that he cordially agreed with all that the hon. Member for Devonport had said with respect to the Admiralty, and on behalf of Portsmouth, the senior naval port, he wanted to thank that Department most cordially for the grant of an extra £60,000 which they had given towards the wages of the men. It was appreciated very much in his own dockyard. Of course they were not satisfied, and he hoped to be able to appeal on behalf of his constituents for a reconsideration of the matter so that the wages might be still further increased. They could not get everything done at once. The Admiralty had done a splendid thing in allowing the men to interview their Lordships, who received them with the greatest courtesy and consideration, and paid the utmost attention to their arguments and grievances. He asked that hon. Members should be reasonable and not hope to get more than they could fairly expect. Personally, he had the greatest confidence that the Admiralty would grant them more money as time went on, and he would go on agitating until the men got more substantial wages than they at present received. They were not paid as they ought to be and as the men were paid in other yards, and it was right and proper that this fact should be pointed out from time to time. If they had many friends like the hon. Member for Birkenhead, they would have a very difficult uphill fight before them. Royal dockyards were established for a particular purpose, namely, for the building, repair, and protection of ships in the Navy, and they were dockyards that could not be done away with, even if it were wished. If any crisis or a war occurred necessitating repairs or protection of ships, the Royal dockyards were the right places for it. He hoped his friends on the Labour benches would not press the matter to a division, although at the same time he was cordially with them as regards the principle on which they had brought the matter forward.

MR J. WARD (Stoke on-Trent) explained that he intervened in the debate because the Labour representatives did not consider that the statement with regard to wages which had been made by the Secretary to the Admiralty was very satisfactory. As far as he was concerned as a Member of Parliament the personal element was absent. They only made pots in Stoke-on-Trent. But, generally speaking, it was obvious that when demands were made upon our national resources in times of national excitement due to war the national dockyards were unable to cope with them, and we had to ask for help from private enterprises. From this arrangement followed the corrupt contract system and scandals that disgraced almost every military expedition sent away from our shores. All this resulted from trying to cripple the resources of the national dockyards in time of peace. We ought more and more to rely upon the national dockyards. No doubt it was quite as bad for workmen employed by private firms to be out of work as for those engaged by the Government, but there was this difference in the nature of the employment. In the Government dockyards Government work simply was done, but private yards could cater for other kinds of work if one particular kind became depressed. He had no wish to advocate an increase of expenditure, but when the House decided to spend a certain amount of money on the two branches of the Service, the Government should at least pay special attention to their own workmen, for the very reason that private yards could undertake other work. Attention had been drawn to the fact that wages were 25 per cent. lower in Government yards than in private yards. A reason for it was to be found in the fact that the Government were diposed to consider to a large extent the employee's pension in the recompense they paid him. This naturally suggested to those who represented organised Labour the necessity of noting such facts and placing their views before the Government.

MR. LAMBERT said he did not know that he could add very much to the statement made by his right hon. friend on this question. After all that was said and done, the Government had only been in office for eighteen months, and during that short period they had had considerable difficulty in obtaining from the keepers of the public purse, the Treasury, assent to an increase of something like £60,000 a year distributed among the various employees in the dockyard. This year precisely the same course of procedure had been followed. The First Lord of the Admiralty had gone to Chatham and Portsmouth, and the Secretary to the Admiralty had interviewed the responsible officials of the other dockyards; and at the present moment the matters which had been brought before them were under the serious consideration of the Department. The Government could not, however, make any further statement just now. He might say that they had not the smallest wish to pay the dockyard hands less than a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. It must be remembered that they were the representatives of the taxpayers of the country, and had a right to demand that a fair day's work should be given for a fair day's wage. The point had been laid before the country, and he would be somewhat sorry to see a division on the subject, for that must have some effect on the ultimate decision. He thought that hon. Members in their own interests should not go to a division, because he did not suppose that they expected to carry the reduction, and the Admiralty would have to pay regard to the decision of the House of Commons. As regards foreign yards, though he could not make a statement, they were actively engaged in considering the matter. The whole Board had been to Gibraltar and to Malta, and they had heard many of the grievances of the men. While he could not make a statement, he could assure the House that the general principle as to the treatment which they had laid down with regard to Government employees would be carried out in, he would not say a generous, but a just spirit that would be extended to men in foreign yards. He hoped the hon. Gentlemen would see their way to withdraw the Amendment; he had laid his reasons before them and it was they who had to decide, but he hoped they would seriously consider the course which he had suggested.

*MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton) said he wished to say a word or two on behalf of a trade that had not participated in the £60,000 increased wages paid on the decision of the Admiralty last year—he referred to the joiners. He wished particularly to call the attention of the Secretary to the

Admiralty to the fact that both joiners and labourers in the Director of Works Department were paid considerably less than similar classes of employees in other sections of the dockyards. In the Director of Works Department they were paid a maximum of 32s. a week and a minimum of 30s. a week; but in connection with that department there were classifications, which system did not prevail in other departments. He found that sometimes a man had to wait ten years before he got an increase of 1s. on his wages; and unless he had influence behind him he got no increase until he was practically qualified for the old-age pension. He hoped that the joiners employed in the Director of Works Department would be placed on exactly the same footing as those employed in other departments connected with the dockyards. He was informed that the labourers in the dockyard received £1 1s. a week, while the labourers in the department to which he referred were paid only £1 a week. He thought he was justified in asking the right hon. Gentleman at any rate to put the lowest paid class of labourers under his control on the same level as those who were engaged in other departments. He would like also to point out that while the principle was recognised in the Royal dockyards of paying a certain class of workman the same wage as was paid in private yards, in the Director of Works Department they were paid considerably less than was paid in private yards; and, seeing that the joiners for whom he spoke did not participate in the increase of wages last year, he hoped that the Admiralty would give special recognition to this trade. A system of bonuses prevailed in the dockyards; he believed that if a man served seven years he got a bonus, but if he was discharged at the end of six years and eleven months he got nothing. Either the bonus ought to be abolished altogether or the man who was discharged through no fault of his own should receive bonus proportionate to that part of the seven years which he had worked. He hoped that the Secretary to the Admiralty would do his utmost to bring all the joiners of the dockyards to the same level so far as wages were concerned. Often these men had to travel some distance to their jobs and had to pay their own fares, and they were also liable to be laid off if the weather was bad. He thought that taking everything into consideration it would be right to abolish the classification in the Director of Works Department, and also that these workmen should be placed on the same level as the joiners in other departments of the dockyards.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said in reference to the guarantee of wages it must be remembered that they were dealing with a fixed sum of money voted by Parliament, and if the wages were increased by 25 per cent. the number of men would have to be reduced by 20 per cent. But the point to which he desired to call attention was that many of these men had another grievance not connected with the amount of their wages, but because they were liable to be vaccinated. A joiner was set on at Portsmouth a short time ago, and when he refused to be vaccinated he was dismissed. This vaccination was not by statute; it was entirely by regulation of the Lords of the Admiralty, and it was a matter wholly within the management and control of the Secretary to the Admiralty and his colleagues, and if he chose he could omit the regulation. It was well known to anyone who knew anything about the question that the people who advocated vaccination held that it was of no use unless it was repeated continually—that unless a person was vaccinated three or four times it was absolutely useless. If a man was vaccinated once at the beginning of his term of office and that was all, it was a useless proceeding. Why then inflict this penalty which sometimes killed a man and often injured him, perhaps seriously?

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said it would be better before the hon. Gentleman proceeded further that they should dispose of the question which they had been discussing.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that he would give careful consideration to the various points which had been raised. What the hon. Member for Chatham had said on another occasion in reference to the matter on which he had spoken that evening had been fully reported, together with the speeches of the hon. Gentleman's friends, and these would be laid before the Board of Admiralty in due time and fully considered. In regard to the joiners in the Director of Works Department being put on the same level as other joiners in the dockyards that was a point which would be fully considered. His hon. friend had asked when the Report would be issued. When it was ready it would be laid before the responsible officials, and when it had been dealt with, and summarised and tabulated, it would then be laid before the Board. He did not think that it would be long delayed. After to-night he would be free to devote more time to these matters. He appealed to the House either to let the Vote pass or be withdrawn, it was immaterial which, because there was another Vote in the hands of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies down for discussion.

MR. SUMMERBELL said that after the interesting discussion which they had he desired to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. MURRAY MACDONALD (Falkirk Burghs) said he had no intention of opposing the withdrawal of this Vote. He had intended to move a reduction of the Vote, because he believed that the provision made in the Estimate for battleships was far in excess of our requirements, but it was obvious that at that time of night they could have no proper discussion of these provisions. Nevertheless, if a division were taken, he and some, at least, of his friends, would show their dissatisfaction by abstaining from voting.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley) regretted than when it was understood that a reduction of this Vote was about to be moved, raising a great question of policy with regard to large battleships they should have no opportunity whatever for discussion. They had been occupied discussing parochial matters which might have been settled by conference with the right hon. Gentleman, with the result that a really important discussion had been prevented from taking place. That was another reflection upon the unbusiness-like proceedings of this House.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said there were many hon. Members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House who by no means shared the regret which had just been expressed and who, like him, were pleased that the Motion for the reduction of the Fleet was not going to be moved and that no opportunity offered for opposing the policy of the Government in this behalf. The Government avowedly maintained the traditional policy of this country in regard to its first line of defence, and its chief arm of attack.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that apparently the hon. Member for Burnley had misunderstood the situation. The previous discussion had been on the general question. The points he had alluded to had only occupied about two hours and it was unfair to say that they were merely parochial questions.

MR. MADDISON said he was not referring to that subject alone. He still thought that hon. Members would have been better advised if they had allowed this Motion for a reduction to come on.

*SIR RANDAL CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) protested against the course that was being pursued. Several Members had been waiting for months for an opportunity of moving a reduction in the cost of naval armaments. And now they were told that in a few minutes time the debate would be brought to a close and that the discussion on this very important question could not take place. He did not know whether those representing the Admiralty were aware of the strong feeling which existed out of doors upon this subject. Many people regarded the subject as one of supreme importance. He wished hon. Members who talked so much about the desirability of old-age pensions would devote themselves seriously to considering where the money was to come from to provide them. [AN HON. MEMBER: Lord Cromer £50,000.] He believed it possible to get the necessary funds by reductions on Army and Navy expenditure. [AN HON. MEMBER: Move your Amendment.] There were some hon. Members who talked about economy and said it was an excellent thing, but not in Chatham, Woolwich or Devonport. [“Oh!” and an HON. MEMBER: Speak for yourself.]

Mr. JENKINS : I have never said any such thing.

Sir JOHN BENN: And I never said any such thing.

*Sir RANDAL CREMER said the hon. Member for Chatham was too astute to use the exact words, but that was the result of the policy he pursued in the House of Commons. It was impossible for hon. Members to realise what they professed so much anxiety about so long as the shameful expenditure on the Army and Navy went on.

Mr. LYNCH(Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): Is the hon. Member in order in alluding to expenditure on the Navy as shameful?

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I cannot say that the expression "shameful expenditure" in the sense used is an unparliamentary expression.

*Sir RANDAL CREMER said he would withdraw "shameful" and use the word "extravagant," which equally well expressed his meaning. The Committee would form their own opinion as to the reasons which had prompted the Front Bench to closure them on the present occasion. He resented it and protested against it. [Cries of "Move, move."] It was not his Amendment, and he had no intention of moving it, because it was quite clear that the course which had been adopted was intended to close their mouths and prevent them from discussing this useless wasteful expenditure of the nation's resources. Having made that protest he would resume his seat.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) assured his hon. friend that what he said was not the fact. No one wished to burke discussion, and the real reason why the Government wanted to withdraw the Vote was that the Under-Secretary desired to make a statement on a matter of vital importance —namely, the abolition of slavery in Zanzibar.

*Mr. REES said he desired to point out that both the hon. Members who desired that this Motion should be moved had themselves stated that they were not going to vote for it, so robust was their belief in their own creed.

Mr. MURRAY MACDONALD, without comment, moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000, in order to allow the sense of the Committee to be taken at once upon the question which he had raised.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,548,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Murray Macdonald.*)

Mr. LUPTON said he heartily agreed with this Amendment. All they required Naval expenditure for was to defend the Empire, and the present expenditure was a great deal too much for that purpose. The Navy Estimates might with safety be reduced by at least £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 a year.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said that during the last few minutes it had been abundantly demonstrated how very improper it would have been to accede to the request of the Front Ministerial Bench opposite to let this enormously important Vote go by with less consideration than one full Parliamentary day. The point he wished to draw attention to was one of the most supreme importance and he hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would be able to give him an answer. The point he alluded to was the remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman with reference to cordite. Whatever view might be taken on the subject, it was certainly one which ought to receive the serious consideration of the House. Some few months ago it was ascertained that a considerable proportion of the cordite on board His Majesty's ships had been so manufactured as to be at this moment entirely untested, and in such a condition that no human being could say with any certainty that it was not in a highly dangerous state. That was admitted and could not be denied. What he complained of was the way in which the Admiralty were dealing with the situation, because they were putting into absolute and real danger, if not all, certainly a large proportion of the ships of the Navy. What did the right hon. Gentleman propose? They had in a large number of magazines cordite which had never been tested and all the Secretary to the Admiralty told them was that it was going to be tested.

He wished to know how and when that cordite was going to be tested. What test was he going to apply? The only possible test, as far as he knew, was the heat test, and he did not believe that could be applied in this particular case. Then it was said that the old cordite was to be used up first, but he did not believe that there were any available means of finding out what were the old and what were the new cartridges in a ship's magazine. The right hon. Gentleman had also stated that "suspicious" cordite was to be destroyed. [Cries of "Divide."] He could assure the Committee that he was not engaged in any attempt to waste time. This seemed to him to be a matter of the greatest importance. A large amount of highly explosive material was on board our ships in all parts of the world. Was there anybody who could tell whether it was safe or not? If it was dangerous, it might produce destruction which would have an enormous effect on the shipbuilding Vote. The steps which the right hon. Gentleman said he had taken to test the cordite were found, on examination, to be perfectly illusory. So far as he knew, the cordite in question could not be tested without being brought home and submitted to a difficult and complicated test. It was perfectly impossible to test it on a man of-war. He did not think it was extravagant to ask the right hon. Gentleman to state some reason for supposing that the steps he had taken to deal with the danger were not illusory.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that the best assurance he could give the hon. Gentleman was that tests to be applied had been recommended by the experts of the Admiralty. He did not understand these things himself, and all he could do was to rely on the information given to him as to the nature of the test. The only test to be applied was one which had recently been in use. If the hon. Gentleman opposite desired to pursue the inquiry further, he would place all the information he could at his disposal.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) said a similar question as to condition of cordite arose in regard to the Army supplies, and the Secretary of State for War said he could give a pledge that the cordite at present in store was absolutely safe. It was desirable that there should be no uncertainty among our sailors as to the safety of the cordite on board ship. He asked an assurance from the Admiralty that the cordite in the magazines at present was free from risk to our seamen.

MR. JENKINS complained of the large amount of constructional work given to private dockyards. He called attention to items on page 88 of the Estimates under the heading of "Coal, &c. for the Fleet." A sum of £1,832,000 for coal was included as a dockyard charge, and he thought it was debited in the wrong place. The figure for the dockyards instead of being £5,000,000 should only be a little over £3,000,000.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said that unless it appeared from the shipbuilding programme next year that the Admiralty had considerably advanced as to the necessity for battleships he and his friends would be obliged to use all the force they could in criticising the programme. As to the torpedo flotilla there had been a great deal of anxiety created in the public mind. A large proportion of the boats were constructed before 1898, at which date Germany commenced the construction of a torpedo flotilla, and now had a flotilla of 146 while we had a flotilla of 143. All the German vessels had been constructed since 1898, but seventy-seven of our vessels were constructed previous to that year. It was important that we should have up-to-date vessels for the proper training of our officers and seamen. This was a subject which caused great anxiety in the minds of every competent critic in the country, and he rose for the purpose of asking the right hon. Gentlemen if he could give the same assurance with regard to this that he had given in respect to the repairs of the cruisers. Would he consider whether he could furnish a printed statement in respect of the torpedo flotilla showing the repairs needed? He had no wish to prolong the debate, but he pressed the right hon. Gentleman to allay the public anxiety which had been created by want of information upon this subject.

*MR. OWEN PHILIPPS (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) said he wished to take this opportunity of expressing his thanks to the Secretary to the Admirality for the sympathetic way in which the Admiralty during the last eighteen months had met the various grievances that the men had laid before them. There were still grievances to be dealt with, and he hoped that they would be arranged in the coming year. He hoped sincerely that next year the Government would not overlook the necessity of providing additional graving docks. It was useless discussing whether we should have a large or small shipbuilding programme, whether we should build few "Dreadnoughts" or many, unless the Government dealt in a practical way with the question of providing graving docks in which these enormous vessels could be repaired quickly in case of accident or damage in time of war. The statement that had been made by a member of the Government upon the question shewed a state of things far from satisfactory. At the present time in the British Empire there were only about thirteen graving docks in which the vessels we were now building could be repaired. He submitted that it was of the greatest importance that there should be a large number of graving docks built throughout the Empire.

* MR. REES said he rose for the purpose of putting two points before the right hon. Gentleman, whose brief and lucid statements always gave him the impression that the right hon. Gentleman had nothing to conceal behind a cloud of verbiage. He asked whether it was desirable that there should be no battleship on the China station. The fact that we were in alliance with a great naval power in the East made it even the more necessary that our flag should not disappear from one of these great stations where it has been accustomed to be flown, and that it should not be flown upon a less powerful warship than in former years. The Americans, the French, and the Germans all had battleships in these waters, and he certainly thought that we also should have at least one such vessel. If we had not enough ships to allow one to be sent to the China station he would suggest that the Government should build one, but he thought that it might be done by a mere rearrangement of the fleets. He also urged that something bigger than a gunboat should control the Persian Gulf, which, politically speaking, was one of the storm centres of the world. This gulf had been cleared of pirates and slaves at the expense of the British taxpayer; it had been opened to the commerce of the world at the expense of the same individual, and his rights and influence in these waters should be jealously maintained at a time when other great Powers were pursuing a policy of more or less peaceful penetration towards the gulf.

* MR. SHERWELL (Huddersfield) said since that complaint had been made that the Amendment had been moved without any statement being made in support of it, he wished to explain, on behalf of his hon. friend who moved it and those who supported him in the Amendment, that he had deliberately abstained from saying anything in support of it out of deference to the desire of the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies to have time to make a statement on the question of slavery in Zanzibar. Personally, he greatly regretted that he and his hon. friends had not been given the opportunity of stating the case for the Amendment, which had been moved in no narrow spirit, but solely because they realised the great social and national importance of keeping naval and military expenditure within reasonable limits. Their view was that the Vote for new construction was not justified by the facts before the Committee.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 86; Noes, 263. (Division List No. 353.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barnes, G. N.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, F.J.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E, Gr'st'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter

Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Lord
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Grampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hudson, Walter
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E
Lehmann, R. C.
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Mackarness, Frederic C.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Shackleton, David James
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Summerbell, T.
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
White, George (Norfolk)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Murray Macdonald and Mr. Sherwell.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J.H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chance, Frederick William
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham,
Cleland, J. W.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'll
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fell, Arthur
Ferens, T. R.
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hervey, F.W.F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman

Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Maclean, Donald
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palme
Wiles, Thomas
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Ten of the clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 15, to put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the Vote under consideration.

Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,900 be granted for the said Service," put, and agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded to put severally the Questions, "That the total amounts of the Votes outstanding in each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, including Supplementary Estimates, and the total amount of the Votes outstanding in the Estimates for the Navy, the Army (including Ordnance Factories) and the Revenue Departments, be granted for the Services defined in those Classes and Estimates:—

CLASS I.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £312,432, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
4. Houses of Parliament Buildings (Supplementary) . . .	5,700
10. Surveys of the United Kingdom . . .	118,905
11. Harbours under the Board of Trade .	16,740
12. Peterhead Harbour .	21,988
14. Public Works and Buildings, Ireland .	122,829
15. Railways, Ireland .	26,270
	312,432."

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 300; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 354.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell, (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rapheal, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpton)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton)
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F. (BuryS.Edm'd
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Nn. Lt.-Col.A.R
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E. Howard
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir William Bull and Mr. Stanley Wilson.

CLASS II.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,182,699, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. House of Lords Offices	17,543
2. House of Commons Offices	22,800
3. Treasury and Subordinate Offices	60,919
4. Home Office	128,735
5. Foreign Office	40,698
6. Colonial Office (including a Supplementary sum of £2,200)	37,900
7. Privy Council Office	6,120
9. Mercantile Marine Services	72,816
10. Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade	1,508
12. Charity Commission	15,892
13. Civil Service Commission	23,750
15. Friendly Societies Registry	5,624
16. Local Government Board	147,782
17. Lunacy Commission, England	10,905
20. Public Record Office	14,190
21. Public Works Loan Commission	1,500
22. Registrar-General's Office, England	25,994
23. Stationery and Printing	418,053
24. Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, &c., Office	13,398
25. Works and Public Buildings Office	52,596
26. Secret Service	10,000
Scotland.	
29. Lunacy Commission	3,799
30. Registrar-General's Office	2,978
Ireland.	
32. Household of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland	2,632
33. Chief Secretary for Ireland	17,756
35. Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	1,051
37. Public Record Office	3,580
39. Registrar-General's Office	7,332
40. Valuation and Boundary Survey	14,848
	£1,182,699"

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 306; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 355.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett,, J. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John
M'Crae, George

M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon

Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcester'sh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn.SirAlexF.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(AntrimS.
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Featherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Major Anstruther-Gray and Mr. Lonsdale.

Class III.

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,569,601, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Law Charges . .	42,774
2. Miscellaneous Legal Expenses . . .	21,944
3. Supreme Court of Judicature . . .	177,556
4. Land Registry . .	22,813
5. County Courts . .	3
6. Police, England and Wales . . .	25,036

Scotland.

	£
10. Law Charges and Courts of Law . . .	50,706
11. Register House, Edinburgh . . .	27,700
12. Crofters' Commission .	2,545
13. Prisons	53,650

Ireland.

	£
14. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions .	37,872
15. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments . .	59,086
16. Irish Land Commission .	139,050
17. County Court Officers, etc.	66,298
19. Royal Irish Constabulary	721,499
20. Prisons	62,556
21. Reformatory and Industrial Schools . .	55,251
22. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum . .	3,262
	£1,569,601"

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 304 ; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 356.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJWilliams (Devonp'rt)
Benn,W(TowerHamlets,S. Geo.
Bertram, Julius

Bethell,SirJH (Essex,Romf'rd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies,Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan,C(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorEMartin (Walsall)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon,RtHnSir W.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordon, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, HughCecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,SirW.D.(Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea,WalterRussell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H.(Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day

Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester,
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor,TheodoreC.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury)
Thompson,J.H.W.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, HenryJ.(York, W.R.)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates,E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm.G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, JohnFrederickPeel
Roberts, S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir William Bull and Mr. Lonsdale.

Class IV.

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,928,337, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Board of Education (including a Supplementary Sum of £200,000)	6,793,646
2. British Museum	111,041
3. National Gallery	7,233
4. National Portrait Gallery	2,897
5. Wallace Collection	3,454
6. Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	30,479
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	141,400
8. Public Education, Scotland (including a Supplementary Sum of £11,000)	1,183,554

	£
9. National Galleries, Scotland	2,416
Ireland.	
10. Public Education . .	648,360
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners . . .	510
12. National Gallery . .	1,147
13. Queen's Colleges . .	2,200
	£8,928,337 "

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 308; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 357.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Crederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.

Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mp'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Sedon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland
Summerbell, J.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset. E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F.W.F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Sir John Randles.

CLASS V.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,407,405, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
1. Diplomatic and Consular Services	319,340
2. Colonial Services (including a Supplementary Sum of £132,690)	910,289
2A. Colonial Services (Jamaica Earthquake Relief, Grant in Aid) .	150,000
3. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable . .	26,776
4. Cyprus (Grant in Aid) .	1,000
	£1,407,405"

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 306; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 358.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes. G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W (Tower Hamlets, S. Geo
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea

Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Mrogan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James

Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks

Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George

Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Craik, Sir Henry

Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'd
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Staveley-Hill and Sir Francis Lowe.

CLASS VI.

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £146,079, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

	£
3. Hospitals and Charities, Ireland . . .	139
4. Savings Banks' and Friendly Societies' Deficiencies . . .	145,940
	£146,079"

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 308; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 359.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.

Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B., Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mptn)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Castlereagh and Captain Hervey.

CLASS VII.

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £386,191, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:—

		£
1.	Temporary Commissions	36,000
2.	Miscellaneous Expenses .	46,151
3.	Repayments to the Local Loans Fund . .	4,601
4.	Ireland Development Grant . . .	85,000
5.	Expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905 . . .	200,000
6.	Repayments to Civil Contingencies Fund .	14,439
		£386,191"

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 307; Noes, 76. (Division List No. 360.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams(D'v'np'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H. (Sussex,E.Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.

Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Brotherton and Mr. Du Cros.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £16,036,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Navy Services, viz. :—

	£
3. Medical Establishments and Services . .	268,700
4. Martial Law . . .	14,200
5. Educational Services .	172,500
6. Scientific Services . .	65,100
7. Royal Naval Reserves .	418,300
8. Section 2. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Matériel . .	3,035,200
8. Section 3. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Contract Work .	7,646,000
9. Naval Armaments . .	2,348,700
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services . . .	401,000
12. Admiralty Office . .	364,600
14. Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances	1,302,000
	16,036,300 "

Question put, and agreed to.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,758,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure on the Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz. :—

	£
2. Medical Establishment, Pay, etc. . . .	460,000
3. Militia, Pay, Bounty, etc.	840,000
4. Imperial Yeomanry, Pay and Allowances . .	410,000

	£
5. Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances . .	1,152,000
6. Quartering, Transport, and Remounts . .	1,909,000
8. Ordnance Department, Establishments and General Stores . .	620,000
11. Establishments for Military Education . .	137,000
12. Miscellaneous Effective Services . . .	67,000
13. War Office and Army Accounts Department	567,000
14. Half Pay, Retired Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers	1,714,000
15. Pensions and other Non-Effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others .	1,709,000
16. Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities . .	173,000
Ordnance Factories .	100
	£9,758,100"

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) protested against this Vote being taken without an opportunity being given of discussing the discharges of men from the Woolwich Arsenal.

Question put, and agreed to.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 304; Noes, 74. (Division List No. 361.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (D'v'np'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)

Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk,Eye
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E. (Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott (Br'df'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord

Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Ed'mds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Nield.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question put, "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ended on the 31st day of March, 1908, the sum of £72,563,714 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 276; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 362.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (D'v'np'rt)
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Ge.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'll
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.

Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walton
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton underLyne)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampton
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Seddon, J.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir William Bull and Mr. Stanley Wilson.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report this Resolution to the House."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 245; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 363.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery C
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gurdon, Rt. Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendal (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston

Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montague, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, John
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partingdon, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson,S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose,Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thompson,J.W.H.,E(Somerset.
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Verney,F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W.Dudley(Southampton
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Coates, E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Grayson, Albert Victor
Gretton, John
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazleton, Richard
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Meysey-Thomson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlington
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Seddon, J.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ashley, and Mr. Hills.

Resolution to be reported this day.

EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.

Order for the Second Reading.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said that this Bill contained a number of small administrative provisions every one of which, he thought, was discussed in last year's Education Bill, and all of which had also been discussed in the other House. The Bill had no general principle running through it, and therefore could only be considered in detail as regarded the effect of each separate clause. The first clause proposed that the local education authority should have power to acquire land for the purposes of secondary schools. It also proposed that land held by the local education authority for elementary purposes might be appropriated by them to secondary purposes, and *vice versa.* Of course, it was quite obvious that a clause of that sort could not raise any very highly contentious matter, and he did not imagine it would do so on the present occasion. The other clauses assimilated the law between borough and county councils. With regard to the levy of a rate for secondary schools, at the present time the limit in county areas was 2d., but in the case of borough areas it was unlimited. The Bill proposed to remove the limit of 2d. in the case of county areas. Again, with regard to the period for the repayment of loans, in the case of boroughs the period of repayment was sixty years, in the case of county councils it was thirty years. The bill proposed once again to put the two councils on the same footing and to extend the period for repayment of loans for school buildings from thirty years to sixty years. Of course, within that limit the consent of the Local Government Board would still be required for such a period as they might sanction. The next important clauses in the Bill related to medical inspection and the provision of vacation schools. [Cries of "Clause 8."] Clause 8 was as follows—

"(1.) If any question arises—(*a*) whether any purpose for which a council wish to exercise their powers under the Education Acts, is within their powers under those Acts; or (*b*) whether any purpose for which a council wish to exercise any powers under the Education Acts is a purpose of Part II. of the Education Act, 1902, or of Part III. of that Act; or (*c*) whether any school, college, or hostel is a school, college, or hostel provided by a council, or a school, college, or hostel aided but not provided by a council; that question shall be referred to and determined by the Board of Education, and their decision shall be conclusive on the matter."

He was rather surprised that that clause should be treated as a remarkable clause. In the administration of the present law questions were constantly arising whether education in some of its special forms was to be considered as elementary or higher, and local education authorities were constantly put to very great trouble to determine on which account the cost of a particular kind of education should be charged. At present the only final determination of the question was the audit with all the subsequent difficulties of overcharge, and he was sure no hon. Member who was familiar with the details of administration of education would not agree that it was most desirable that these purely technical points, which did not raise a single controversial question, should be settled at once by some competent authority. For that reason it was proposed now that the Board of Education should decide beforehand to which account all these particular expenses should be charged instead of leaving the question to be determined afterwards on the audit of accounts. Subsection 2 of Clause 8 provided—

"(2) For the purposes of the Education Acts, the providing, or aiding the provision of, any training or instruction of any kind whatever, and any like purpose which the Board of Education determine to be an educational purpose, shall be deemed to be educational purposes; and the expression 'education' in those Acts shall be construed accordingly."

What was intended by this clause was to bring apprenticeship in as one of the educational purposes to which endowments were devoted. It was very necessary that apprenticeship should be regarded as an educational purpose, and it was proposed under this subsection to give the Board of Education power to regard apprenticeship as an educational purpose. If hon. Gentlemen were able in that to discover some deep controversial matter he would be glad to hear from them wherein it lay, and, so far as he could, meet their views. He thought it was advisable to say here that this Bill was introduced as a non-contentious measure and was intended to be so. If in

Committee any proposal in the Bill was objected to by the Party opposite and was officially opposed by them he would certainly not press it. He had had considerable help with the Bill from time to time from the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University, and he would certainly not, against his advice or wish, endeavour to press any of the provisions upon the House, but it must be understood that every one of its provisions was purely educational.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): What about its finance?

MR. McKENNA said if the finance was objected to it was not objected to in the late Bill. This Bill was introduced as a non-contentious Bill and it should retain that character. He could not say that irresponsible opposition by individuals would be accepted by him as a ground for dropping this or that clause; but responsible objection to any of the clauses would be treated by the Government as rendering the clause contentious, and he certainly would not put the House to the trouble of discussing such clauses. He hoped after that explanation it would be understood that the Bill contains many clauses which were of real value for educational purposes, and it would be a serious loss to the children of the country if it were treated as a contentious measure. With regard to Clause 10, which provided for medical inspection, he need only say that this was the same clause which was introduced as a separate Bill by his hon. friend the Member for Scarborough, and which had already received the complete approval of this House, and had reached the last stage before Third Reading. As the Bill now before the House contained the original clause, and as he had now an opportunity of pressing this Bill forward, he proposed to keep the clause in question in the Bill. But as the clause had already been discussed at length in this House he did not think it was necessary for him to enlarge upon it now. The only remaining clauses were Clause 11, which said distance from school was to be no excuse for non-attendance when a conveyance was provided, and Clause 12, which dealt with the registration of the teaching profession. He thought from the short explanation he had given it would be quite manifest that this was a Bill which ought to be sent to a Committee, where he was sure it would receive adequate consideration.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON thought the right hon. Gentleman had overrated the amount of help he was kind enough to say he had received from him, and had somewhat underrated the importance of some of the provisions of the Bill. The help he gave the right hon. gentleman did not go further than to say that some of the clauses be regarded as entirely non-controversial, but that to the clauses dealing with vacation schools and medical inspection he attached the greatest importance. There were other clauses which required explanation and discussion, such as Clause 8 which had never been discussed at all in the Bill of last year, and this and some others must be regarded as matters of controversy. The three seriously contentious matters in the Bill were the extension of the borrowing and purchasing powers of local authorities, the extension of rating power, and the introduction of Clause 8 from Part II. of the Education Bill of last year. Whatever might have been his views as to the policy of this Bill at the commencement of the session, they had been largely altered by the policy which the right hon. Gentlemen had formulated. The increase of the extension of the borrowing powers of the local authority and of the term of repayment from thirty to sixty years might, in any circumstance, be regarded as a dangerous concession to authorities, whose indebtedness was already a cause of national anxiety; they had further to regard it in connection with the settled policy of the Board of Education, as at present constituted, to crush out denominational schemes whenever the opportunity offered. He would give two instances of this matter—the case of the Low Valley school, discussed the other night, and the Halifax school—a case in which a serious act of oppression was condoned by the Board of Education, despite the remonstrations addressed to it. These two instances showed that the Board of Education would not stand in the way of a local authority which desired to efface a voluntary school from its educational system. To encourage a local authority to do this by diminishing the immediate cost to the ratepayers seemed to him to introduce an argument against this extension of borrowing powers which was not present in their minds when the session began. But the action of the Board of Education in the case of Halifax showed that the Board could not be trusted—as he had hoped a Government Department could be trusted—to support a minority against unjust pressure, and that made them very careful in regarding any extension of the powers of the local authorities which would make it easier for them to do what the Board of Education was only too willing to allow them to do.

MR. McKENNA said the Local Government Board settled the terms. The Board of Education had nothing to do with it, and as a matter of fact the limit was now sixty years.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the Local Government Board might determine the period, but the Bill was the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman, and it was the Board of Education which was introducing this measure, which would approach the Local Government Board to extend the period of repayment. Again, the 2d. rate which at present could only be exceeded in county boroughs was now to be exceeded with the permission of the Local Government Board in all counties. He would have said that there might be some reason for some extension of the powers of the great county councils having regard to his own recollection of some of the irksome restrictions, as he thought, imposed in certain cases by the Local Government Board, but here again they had to bear in mind and to read this in the light of the secondary schools and training college regulations. Hitherto the county councils had been very willing to accept the assistance of the denominational training colleges; they had not set up rival training institutions; they had in certain cases been anxious to build hostels, and economise their own resources, and that was now forbidden by the right hon. Gentleman in his last regulations. He was not quite sure that after the right hon. Gentleman's explanation anyone fully understood what the entire purport of these regulations might be. But there could be no doubt that the policy of the Board of Education was to drive these denominational secondary schools and training colleges out of existence, and that the extension of the rating power of the county councils would make it easier for them to fall in with the policy of the Board of Education, if indeed they were not compelled to do so under the extremely irksome regulations of the right hon. Gentleman. That extension of the rating powers beyond the twopenny rate appeared to him to put a very different complexion on the provision from what it bore when introduce into the Bill of last year, or when it was introduced into the Bill at the commencement of the session. Again, the defining powers of the Board of Education, which were never discussed under the Bill of last year, might be regarded in two different ways. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that where there was a question whether the local education authority were properly spending money on objects of education it was the Board of Education and not the auditor of the Local Government Board who could more properly determine whether the objects were educational or not. But they must read this clause in the light of Part II. of the Bill of last year. That section gave to the Board of Education enormous power in dealing with trusts of every description, and then there followed this defining power for the Board of Education to say what was educational or not. Under the powers given in that clause the Board of Education might have taken any trust, of whatever character, whether denominational or not, and have treated it as educational, and put upon it another character. He called the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to this when the Bill was first printed. He could not regard this clause without grave suspicion, and it was no good to say that, as the Bill ran, these defining powers might not do any harm. They would put a weapon in the hands of the Board of Education which might be extremely formidable if, as was possible, Part II. of the Bill of last year was revised. It was useless to say that under these circumstances a limitation would be imposed. There could, he thought, however, be no doubt that the Bill contained useful provisions, and on both sides of the House there was a desire to pass the clauses for medical inspection in schools, and they would have been passed before now but for the action of the right hon. Gentleman. At the request of the right hon. Gentleman, the hon. Member for Scarborough did not proceed with the Third Reading of his Bill, and the question of medical inspection now stood in a state of suspended animation until next year, unless that Bill was taken up by the Government or the clause was carried in this Bill.

MR. MCKENNA said the hon. Gentleman ought to state the whole facts.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON replied that the hon. Member for Scarborough had stated that he would not take a Third Reading, because he was so desired by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. MCKENNA: I asked my hon. friend not to take a Third Reading, but I also stated the reason why I asked it, and I think the hon. Baronet should state it to the House.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he wished to say no more than this, that the Bill would have been law by this time if the right hon. Gentleman had not interposed. He hoped he would repeat correctly what the right hon. Gentleman told him, viz., that he was sitting at a meeting of the Cabinet when the Bill was under discussion in the House, and that he thought Amendments might be introduced which he would be obliged not to accept, and therefore he did not wish the Third Reading of the Bill to take place until he had considered it.

MR. MCKENNA explained that there were certain Amendments on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member who sat below the gangway, and he did not know what Amendments had been accepted or not. If the Bill had gone through the Third Reading the clause in his own Bill would have been dropped out, and the opportunity of passing his clause would have been lost.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said it did not become law because the right hon. Gentleman, no doubt for a good reason, interposed, and did not allow it to go to a Third Reading. He was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman was going to deal with this Bill in, as he described it, a non-contentious spirit. The points which he (Sir William Anson) had dealt with, however, were extremely contentious, and they would not be able to

be embodied in the Bill without prolonged and serious discussion. But though there were other parts of the Bill which they hoped would become law, in addition to the provision for medical inspection, it must not be considered in any case that the Bill was a non-contentious one. The whole policy of the Board of Education, and the way in which the discussion on that policy had been burked and frustrated by the refusal to grant the Opposition more time to consider that policy, and the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had departed from invariable custom in not giving them an explanation of what his policy was in this case, had very much altered the frame of mind in which they would approach the Bill.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Dr. MACNAMARA, Camberwell, N.) said he wished to make a few remarks on the question of extension of the period of loans. Section 57 of the Education Act of 1870, as amended by Section 10 of the Education Act of 1873, gave power to the Board of Education, which had been exercised by successive Tory and Liberal Presidents ever since, down to 1902, to give a period of repayment of 50 years. That was modified by the Local Government Act of 1888, which restricted the period for the repayment of money borrowed by a county council to 30 years. The Education Act of 1902, not their Act, but that of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, altered the position, and made the period of repayment, so far as it affected urban areas, 60 years, and he was astonished to find a grievance was found in the fact that it was now proposed to universalise what the right hon. Gentleman in 1902 gave to the urban areas. All the Board of Education proposed to do now was to universalise the 60 years, both for adminstrative counties and for urban areas. He ventured from a purely educational point of view to hope that the House would give a Second Reading to the Bill. It contained some most valuable provisions. The proposal to enable a local authority to acquire land for higher education and to divert land acquired for elementary education purposes to the needs of higher education was most valuable. The medical inspection provided in the Bill had been universally acclaimed, and by no man more cordially than the Leader of the Opposition last year, as one of the most valuable enactments placed before the House in recent years. Again, Section 12, dealing with the teachers' register, was an extremely important proposal. What the Government now proposed, after consultation with eminent teachers of all grades, was that there should be laid on the profession itself an obligation to set up a teachers' register. This was bound to be of the greatest value to teachers and to education generally. He hoped for these reasons that this Bill would be passed into law.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that first of all the Bill proposed to extend very largely the administrative powers of the Board of Education. With regard to that, the extension of its administrative powers might certainly raise some criticisms for those who had not perhaps that full confidence in the administrative action of the right hon. Gentleman which his own supporters had. Some hon. Members had reason to find fault with some of the right hon. Gentleman's administrative actions. He had withdrawn from the power of Parliament altogether some very important matters. This Bill proposed largely to increase the powers of the right hon. Gentleman—and in a very extraordinary way. He sought the power of entirely demolishing the distinctions set up between Parts II. and III. of the Act of 1902, respecting the expenditure and the administration of elementary and secondary education. Was not this a singular power to entrust, not to Parliament, but into the hands of a central department? But there was something more which the right hon. Gentleman sought for his department. He might declare that what had hitherto been considered to be current expenditure was hereafter to be considered as capital expenditure. Was not that a rather dangerous power to seek to add to the prerogative of the central department? He did not object to the extension of the period of repaying loans, if this was generally considered proper; but there was a very much more serious principle in the Bill to which no attention had been paid. He referred to Clause 7, under which the power of borrowing was to be extended from public authorities to managers of private institutions. Could the right hon. Gentleman point to any precedent for that?

Mr. McKENNA: Clause 7 will be altered.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK claimed that at any rate he had pointed out this unprecedented provision.

Mr. McKENNA: Will the hon. Gentleman allow me to explain? I said that any of these clauses which were objected to by right hon. Gentlemen opposite I would withdraw. I have offered to withdraw Clause 8

Sir HENRY CRAIK: Clause 7?

Mr. McKENNA: I will amend Clause 7. If the hon. Gentleman objects to it I will withdraw it.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK: I contend that the right hon. Gentleman would not have withdrawn it if I had not pointed it out.

Mr. McKENNA: I said in opening that I would withdraw any clause to which the hon. Baronet opposite objected.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK said that this was a clause which was not drawn attention to by the hon. Baronet. But there was something more—Clause 8. Was that one of the clauses to be dropped? It was a very difficult thing to discuss a Bill which was to be whittled away in this fashion. The Bill would give to the Board of Education the power of saying what should not be considered education, but something else, and the right to say that what had not been considered education at all was in future to be education, if the President of the Board desired. But if this Bill was to be whittled away as one objection after another was raised all he could say was that criticism became difficult, and an urgent reason was supplied for ample debate. As to Clause 10, they had been told that it was a matter of common agreement. They were told that they passed the Bill of the hon. Member for Scarborough, but he would ask the President of the Board of Education to remember that they passed that as the Bill of a private Member subject to the restrictions to which a Bill of a private member was always subject. A private Member could not propose expenditure from public funds; but the present proposal was a great change in the whole administration of England, a change which was one of the most far-reaching that could be made, and if it was to be taken up by the Government it must be put forward in a somewhat different shape from that which they had been prepared to accept in the Bill of the hon. Member for Scarborough. The present Bill placed on a local authority the burden —not only gave it the power, but placed upon it the duty—of the medical inspection of every child who entered the school. He entirely admitted that this was a duty which should be undertaken, but if it was enforced in the Bill system and assistance must be supplied from the Central Department. Government must not place on local authorities a duty which it would be impossible for them to carry out. If this was enforced the local authorities would find themselves in serious difficulties. If this was to be the Government scheme it ought to be made much more complete, much more perfect, much more scientific, much more on the level of that which existed in every country except our own. The other day they were told that the present Government was a Government of water-tight compartments. He did not think there could be a better illustration of the truth of this than that the House had before it at that moment two Bills, one for England, one for Scotland—which, with regard to medical inspection, proceeded on entirely different lines. The Government did not lay the duty of inspection universally on the school boards for Scotland, but they did lay it universally on the school-boards for England. The Secretary for Scotland had proposed a Bill reasonable in this respect which contemplated joint action between the Scottish Education Department and the local education authority. Was it possible that two members of the Cabinet —the President of the Board of Education and the Secretary for Scotland—could propose these absolutely diverse measures without laying their heads together? Was it not possible to concoct a scheme which would bring about a real, practical, and feasible state of things? Then there was another clause as to vacation schools. He took leave, with all respect to the President of the Board of Education, to say that this was a mere shop-window dressing. There was absolutely nothing in the Acts as they existed at present which prevented any educational authority from having a vacation school to-morrow. The Bill did not give to authorities a penny of grant. What was wanted was to give encouragement to them and to inform them that assistance would be held out to them in this work. If the Government refrained from doing so they would only be repeating the tentative proposals of a private Member. Was this the way to act—to tell school boards to appoint vacation schools, which they all knew could be done to-morrow if they liked, without any special permission? The President of the Board of Education, he noticed, shook his head.

MR. McKENNA said the charge could not be imposed upon the elementary school rate.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said that the right hon. Gentleman took the power of saying what was secondary education and what was elementary education, and indeed what was education at all. There was another distinction between the two Bills proposed by members of the same Cabinet. The Secretary for Scotland wished some additional power; he desired to be able to define education, and he had a clause in his Bill giving himself that power. If the proposal of the President of the Board of Education had been the same as that of the Secretary for Scotland he would not have objected. The Secretary for Scotland proposed to do it by a Code or Minute laid before this House, so that the House itself should be the ultimate authority. They knew that the President of the Board of Education had withdrawn from the House subjects which had hitherto always been the subject of Minutes open to discussion. Unlike his colleague, the Secretary for Scotland, he was not prepared to say that his definition of education was to be laid down in a Minute. The House might well pause when they saw two Ministers proposing entirely different courses in matters of precisely the same kind, and let him assure the House that there was no difference between the circumstances or administration of Scotland which distinguished it from England in this respect. For these reasons he must say for himself, although he had no wish to divide the House on the point, that there were the most serious difficulties with regard to the Bill. The main benefits it conferred were those of medical inspection. He believed it did it in a specious way that would prove ineffectual, and he strongly objected to the wide extension of administrative power given to the right hon. Gentleman who had by his action quite recently shown so much desire to withdraw the policy of his Department from the criticism of this House.

MR. ACLAND (Yorkshire, Richmond) said he did not wish to say anything controversial, but one thing was clear, and that was that whatever might have been the fact as to the Government being a Government of water-tight compartments, this debate had already shown that the Opposition on this subject at all events was an Opposition of water-tight compartments, because anything more directly contrary in spirit than the speeches of the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University and the hon. Member for Glasgow University he had seldom heard. The hon. Member for Oxford University had, he thought, very rightly dealt with the Bill in the spirit in which he believed the Bill had been conceived and introduced, namely, that it should be an agreed Bill and that it should contain only matters which were educational and non-controversial. He was sure the hon. Baronet wished to continue to treat the Bill in that way and not to make controversial matters in the Bill which were of educational benefit and did not raise religious or other acute questions. But the Member for Glasgow University had from the beginning to the end of his speech said nothing in favour of any part of the Bill.

SIR HENRY CRAIK: I beg pardon, I did say that with many clauses, especially those dealt with by the Secretary to the Local Government Board, I entirely agreed.

MR. ACLAND said the best adjective the hon. Gentleman had been able to find for the provision as to medical inspection was that it was specious. He thought that it would be most lamentable if the attitude of the hon. Member for Glasgow University, as contrasted with that of the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University, was to be the general attitude of the Opposition to the Bill. He still hoped the Bill might be treated in the spirit in which it was prepared and brought forward, and be confined, as he thought it was, to non-contentious matters of education. In that hope he ventured to mention other matters which had hitherto been treated entirely as non-controversial, and which he thought it might be possible for the Minister for Education to accept in Committee. The first was an Amendment which he moved last year, and which was accepted by hon. Members opposite, with regard to the practising schools attached to training colleges. His opinion was that these practising schools were not in the nature of public elementary schools. His Amendment, which was accepted by both sides, was to make it possible for the Board of Education to make special regulations governing them. He hoped if the Amendment were moved, and it was found to be, as it was last year, entirely non-controversial, it might be accepted by the right hon. Gentleman and added to the Bill. The second matter was this. There was in Part II. of last year's Bill, in a great mass of matter which no doubt was very controversial, a clause which was, he thought, not controversial, namely, that which would have enabled the governors of a great many endowed schools to make alterations in their schemes and rules without getting the permission of the original governors, who in many cases had been dead for hundreds of years. There had been a set of schools which had earnestly desired to alter their rules and regulations, but had been unable to do it except by consent of a dead person. Unless that difficulty were got over by administrative action, as he believed it might be, everyone would consent that these schools should be allowed to alter their schemes by the adoption of the very simple clause which was contained in the Bill of last year. He only made these two practical suggestions on matters which he believed might be regarded as non-controversial; but he hoped if the example of the hon. Member who spoke last was going to be followed by the Opposition in general, that the Minister for Education would abandon his attitude, which was as friendly as that of the hon. Member for Oxford University, and insist, even if fought, upon forcing through such clauses as those relating to health inspection, and holiday vacation schools, and that if necessary, he would keep the House sitting a few days longer in order to get these things through.

*Mr. WYNDHAM (Dover) said the hon. Member for the Richmond Division of Yorkshire had made a speech which showed, he thought, that hon. Members did not quite appreciate the position in which they found themselves to-night. The hon. Member had made two practical suggestions which might very well be entertained if they were discussing a Bill which dealt only with practical questions on the educational system of the country. Those suggestions came at the end of the hon. Gentleman's speech. The beginning of his speech consisted in drawing a distinction not apparent to him or, he thought to any other Member on the Opposition Benches, between the speech made by the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of Oxford, and that made by the hon. Member for the University of Glasgow. He listened to both speeches, and they were identical in their purport. Both hon. Members, speaking with authority on these matters, stated that there were in the Bill some practical proposals, but that the finance of the Bill was controversial, and they both stated that to give greater financial powers and latitude to local bodies was a matter which must be reviewed in the light of the educational policy of the present President of the Board of Education. There was not a pin's point between the two speeches. Both of his hon. friends said that the Bill contained certain practical proposals of value, but that the Bill demanded close investigation, discussion, and perhaps opposition upon those two cardinal features of policy, namely, finance and the religious element in education. Could there be two more controversial subjects? The hon. Member who had just spoken apparently thought he was straining the point. He was not. The Minister in charge of the Bill had said that it was brought in in a non-controversial manner, and so it was: it was brought in without a word of explanation. He fully recognised that the right hon. Gentleman had done all in his power to-night to make it a non-controversial Bill. If it could be made so, well and good; but it could not be made a non-controversial Bill so long as it contained at least five, and he thought seven, clauses touching the whole financial question, which was the most contentious at the present moment. All these financial clauses gave greater latitude and greater power to local educational bodies which had been used, and which they believed would be used, in a sense which they considered highly controversial. That was the whole question before them. The Bill was brought in in February without a word of explanation, and was fished up again at the end of July, and though he admitted it was now brought forward in a most conciliatory manner, it still contained at least five clauses fundamentally affecting the financial question, and giving a latitude in a direction to which the Opposition took great exception. Was that a non-controversial Bill?

Mr. McKENNA: I have offered to withdraw any Clause in the Bill to which the hon. Baronet objects. If that does not make a Bill non-controversial, I do not know what does.

*Mr. WYNDHAM said that if he had not fully recognised the spirit in which the right hon. Gentleman made that statement he had failed to express his meaning. But he was entitled to ask that if he meant what he said—and he knew he did—what was the sense of bringing this Bill up again on the 31st of July if it contained provisions which might be justly characterised as he had described them? He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was aware of the fact that some of these clauses were highly controversial, but he might tell him that the Opposition as a whole were not prepared to be lectured on the previous day for having piled up the debt of the country and increased its annual expenditure during their period of office and then to be asked, at one o'clock in the morning, to pass as non-controversial a Bill which stimulated the borrowing of money throughout the whole of the country, and which stimulated it in connection with that particular Department which showed as great an increase in expenditure as the Army and the Navy put together.

Mr. CHURCHILL was understood to dissent from this remark.

*MR. WYNDHAM said it was a fact that in the ten years during which the Unionists were in power the increase upon Army and Navy Estimates added together was the same as the increase during the same period on the educational expenses, viz., 60 per cent. in each case. They did not grudge the money spent on this, but they should not be taunted with extravagance. Was it right that they should be asked at that hour to pass a Bill which would add to our expenditure, and dip deeper into the money market by increasing the borrowing powers of local bodies? He repeated the statement that a large proportion of the increase in the annual expenditure of the country was due to education, and the main difficulty they had to face in the financial situation was, as stated on the previous evening by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the depreciation of securities due to great borrowing. Here was a Bill which authorised greater borrowing in many of its clauses, and it increased the expenditure because of this. That was a point which could not be ignored and passed over as a mere non-controversial adjunct to certain practical proposals to benefit education. There was another aspect of the financial clause which must be considered. He gathered from the attitude of the hon. Member below the gangway that they had only got to put in the Bill that the period of borrowing might be extended to sixty years in order to ensure that people might be able to borrow on those terms. He thought the finance of the Bill required most careful consideration. He had read the Bill with some care, and he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had decided, through pressure, to allow the public bodies to borrow from the Public Loans Commissioners without sanction, even if it was spread over sixty years. He remembered that only two years ago a Bill was passed through that House—a Housing Bill—giving local bodies the power to spread the period of repayment over eighty years. When the Bill became an Act everybody was delighted; but afterwards they found that they could only borrow from the outside market for eighty years, and that when they came to the Public Loans Commissioners they could only borrow for twenty years. What was the financial basis of this Bill? Were the Public Loans Commissioners going to spread the period of repayment for loans borrowed from them over sixty years? If not they would decide the term of repayment as they decided it now, under existing Acts, and that enabled them to put it at twenty years, which was the period they generally fixed. The objection he took to the Bill was that by extending the period of repayment and passing the clause, it stimulated public bodies to take up loans which lowered their credit. In doing this they were doing their best to depress the credit of the country and at the same time they created a vast debt. They would lower the price of Consols and they would not get their schools built. That was a matter which could not be called non-controversial. There were in the Bill, as everyone recognised, and as he recognised fully, certain practical Amendments in our educational system which ought to be adopted, and which he hoped would be adopted; but the Bill raised financial questions which affected a most burning controversy at the present moment. Because it raised these questions it also touched and affected the only other great burning question between the two sides, namely, the controversy over religious education. To describe a Bill which brought in these two burning subjects of controversy as noncontroversial was a misuse of language. The right hon. Gentleman said he would withdraw clauses of a controversial nature. If he were sincere and withdrew every clause which touched finance—and most of these clauses touched local finance, and gave local authorities greater powers against religious views largely held by Members of the Opposition—then they would not have much left in the Bill.

*MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): said he thought the House was engaged in a very futile business. They were told on one side that the Bill would not be pressed if it was controversial and they were told on the other side that practically the whole of the Bill was to be considered as controversial. The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down picked out five or six clauses out of a very short Bill which he deemed controversial, and he (the speaker) thought therefore it would be better for the House to understand what the position of the Minister of Education was in regard to it. If, at the bidding of hon. Members opposite, he was prepared to withdraw one clause after another, then it seemed to him it would be better not to introduce the Bill at all. He did not say it was at the request of hon. Members opposite, but it was at the request of the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University, and with his approval, that most of the clauses were introduced. The hon. Baronet had taken strong opposition to some of the main clauses of the Bill. He thought it was well to recognise that the hon. Members for Oxford University and Glasgow University began and ended their speeches by practically stating that they could not receive this Bill from the President of the Board of Education. It was quite evident that his action in regard to other matters had raised a spirit of opposition in the minds of those hon. Gentlemen, and their conduct would make it extremely difficult for the Bill to pass through the House. The President of the Board of Education had expected and he thought he had a right to expect that a Bill drawn in this way would receive practically the assent, with probably some small Amendments in Committee, of hon. Gentlemen opposite. They were told very often that they could not discuss the question of education without the religious difficulty being brought in. Now here was a Bill in which, with the exception of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, he did not think any previous speaker had actually discovered any religious difficulty; but the right hon. Gentleman had discovered not only a financial but a religious difficulty. Therefore, they had these two great elements of opposition brought into a Bill which was only intended to do, and which would, he believed, do thoroughly, good educational work, and would have been received in that spirit if it had come from any other hands than those of the right hon. Gentleman who at that moment occupied the position of President of the Board of Education. A great deal had been said in regard to the administration of the right hon. Gentleman, but it would not be in order for him to go into the details of the opposition to it; he would say, however, that if hon. Members opposite could not be the favourites of the Department they posed as martyrs. He believed that the right hon. Gentleman was attempting to administer the Education Act fairly, and was receiving the same spiteful opposition that had once before been prominent. In these circumstances he felt it impossible to deal at length with the matters which were concerned in the Bill. Even the two clauses which had been incorporated from the Bill of the hon. Member for Scarborough had undergone the most scathing attack from the Member for Glasgow University. Yet the hon. Member, he believed, was among the Members who supported that Bill; but, now that it became a Government measure in the hands of the President of the Board of Education, he used the most scathing criticism upon that very clause, which, certainly, whatever might be said about other parts of the Bill, was of the most humanitarian kind and one which it would be thought every lover of education would like to see in an Act of Parliament. It was quite idle to suppose that the Bill could be treated in a non-controversial spirit after what had been said by hon. Members opposite. The President of the Board of Education had said in deference to so superior an authority as the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University, that he would withdraw one clause after another, but they must remember that the right hon. Gentleman himself had not been a free agent in the controversy. He had sufficient belief in the right hon. Gentleman's interest in education to fancy that if he were a free agent he would give a different handling to the Bill before them. He made these observations because he thought they were wasting time unless they came to a decision as to the way in which the Goverment was to be treated. If the right hon. Gentleman went on with the Bill he would give it the best support in his power, as he believed, although a great deal had been said against it of a specious character, that it defended the great interests of education without touching at all those great controversial matters which unfortunately were mixed up with education.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) congratulated the right hon. Gentleman upon the tone and the spirit which had actuated him during the discussion. He most sincerely hoped that in years to come when he occupied a high position that tone and temper would continue and would be manifested in action. But there must be a great change before that happy condition of things arrived. He personally had been closely connected with a school in Halifax and he remembered that in the school, which was now being rebuilt from voluntary funds, almost the whole of the school children's parents—something like eighty-one out of eighty-five—were enthusiastic in their opposition to what they regarded as the oppression, the hardship, almost the tyranny, of the action of the right hon. Gentleman. With reference to the powers given under this Bill he wished to say that this year for the first time enormous proposals had been made with reference to training colleges and secondary schools. He was quite sure that the right hon. Gentleman had acted towards the House and Members with perfect good faith; but he could not forget, and he would not omit to remind the House, that the right hon. Gentleman had given to him, no doubt in good faith, the clearest and most distinct promise that there was to be a discussion in the course of this year on the new regulations with regard to training colleges, secondary schools, and the Code. Notwithstanding this promise, made, he repeated, in perfect good faith, the fact remained, and it would not be forgotten throughout the history of education, that these changes had been imposed on the House without any opportunity for a useful discussion. He would refer to one or two clauses which he hoped would disappear from the Bill. The first request he had to make was to omit Subsection (4) of Clause 1. It concerned the power given to alienate land or buildings acquired for the purpose of education under Part II. of the Education Act, and the power to dispose of the proceeds. This seemed to him a power which under no circumstances whatever ought to be given to any Administration. The properties which the clause referred to were held to a very large extent under trusts, and had a great influence on the cause of education. They were doing work which he believed, in most cases, was of an admirable character. He was altogether opposed to the proposal to permit anyone to step in and alienate property as was proposed by the Bill. No property ought to be alienated except under a scheme carefully devised, largely discussed, and not adopted except after the most mature consideration. Clause 8, he understood, had practically gone. Such a clause he felt sure could not stand the test of discussion. He would say a word about Clause 10, which dealt with the vacation schools and the medical inspection of children. He hoped that this clause would become law this year. He had previously supported these proposals. Partly as an educationalist and partly as one who had given much time to sanitary reform he welcomed with all his heart the proposal which made it a duty incumbent on the authority to examine every child before or at the time of admission to school. This was a change which would produce in a course of a few years a revolution in the sanitary condition and the health of the working classes of the country. He was well aware how difficult the task was. It had already been attempted in the city of Manchester, and was being carried out there. Two medical gentlemen—one of them a near relative of his own—were engaged in the task. He hoped that it would never go forth that a clause like that one had ever been objected to in the House of Commons. He hoped that this clause would also receive the unanimous support of the House of Lords, and would be placed on the Statute-book before Parliament rose. There was a comic side in connection with the clause. The clause as introduced by the hon. Member for Scarborough was a copy of the clause in the Bill before them. The Secretary for the Department proposed an Amendment which the House on Report unanimously accepted. He should have pleasure at some later stage in asking the Government to amend the clause in conformity with the Amendment which had been carried. He would for once endeavour to serve the Government in serving himself. There were two more clauses to which he wished to refer. One was the question of extending the time for loans. He himself was in favour of that extension. First of all, he thought in these matters they ought not to take too narrow a view; and secondly, when they approached the question more closely and more in detail, they could not be otherwise than struck by the most substantial character of the new buildings. They had in them as regards durability far more than thirty years wear, and, as regarded utility for the purposes of education, the designs were now so complete, and the provisions so perfect, that, as regarded their becoming antiquated, there was little danger of that in a period of thirty, forty, fifty, or even sixty years

There was one other point he would refer to, and that was the register. He could not go into detail, the whole question was so highly technical, but he thought they ought to have some further explanation as to the manner in which the new register was to be framed. He would in the most friendly way invite the Government to examine this clause more fully and to amplify it by regulations, either in the nature of an Order in Council or some other form, which would enable the House to deal more carefully with this most important question, which affected every teacher, and as such, ought to affect every child in our schools. There were some provisions which he would not go back upon at this moment as to Orders in Council. He hoped that all these Orders in Council would be placed on the Table and would not obtain validity until they had laid there for a reasonable time and before full publicity had been given to them. There was very little service in placing a Paper on the Table when no notice was taken of it and no reference made to it. If they would refer to the records of the House it would be found that the number of Papers laid on the Table was almost bewildering. He hoped that in the matter of Orders in Council under this Bill every care would be taken that there should be full publicity and every opportunity for discussion in the House. There were some parts of the Bill, notably that relating to vacation schools and the health of the children, which he most earnestly desired to see passed. He had ventured to criticise some points, and he trusted the words he had spoken had not been spoken in vain.

*Mr. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that when the Education Act of 1902 was before the House many of them differed with regard to its proposals, but when it became law and they tried to make the best of it, and when they sat as members of the Education Committees throughout the country to carry it out they found that it had not anticipated important points in some of its administrative provisions. He only wished to make an appeal, whether this Bill did not allow an opportunity for the friendly co-operation of educationalists on both sides of the House to try to minimise the points of difference and centre on those points by which they could release the deadlock which at present held in some departments of educational work. In regard to his own constituency he would point out that at the present moment a school for higher education could not be built, although the plans had been passed, unless they consented in this House to pass into law the last heading of Clause 1., sub-section 2, by which a site that already belonged to the corporation of Morecambe might be applied for the purpose of a technical and art school. Another point was that the Local Government Board had discovered that certain building powers they had granted to them as an education committee in Lancashire could not be continued. The law officers of the Department, he presumed, said they could not continue to do that which had been done, and at the present moment the borough of Accrington desired to extend its technical school, but the moneys provided under the Technical Education Act had been exhausted and they had not got the power to go beyond the penny rate, which was exhausted. Therefore, he made an appeal on these two points that they had the opportunity in the one case by adopting a section now in the Bill, and in the second place by adopting a clause which he would move in Committee which would give the Local Government Board the power they desired. If the Bill were considered in the calmer atmosphere of the Committee they could eliminate any controversial points and as educationalists provide a way out of the deadlock. In Lancashire the building of secondary schools was at a standstill. As the President of the Board of Education had promised to approach the consideration of the clauses in a non-controversial manner he hoped the hon. Baronet opposite would exercise his influence over his colleagues and allow the Bill to go upstairs where they might endeavour to remove difficulties. He was afraid his right hon. friend went rather too far in laying himself open to the charge that he would withdraw anything to which the Opposition objected. He thought his right hon. friend ought to make it understood that he would only withdraw those clauses which after the careful consideration of the responsible leaders of the Opposition were held to be out of sympathy with the views to which the hon. Baronet had already committed himself. At any rate, if they got into Committee the public would know through the Press who were the Members who were prepared to prostitute for Party purposes or religious animosities the great educational interests desired to be secured by the passing of this Bill.

MR. ASHLEY said the right hon. Gentleman's conduct on this Bill had been extraordinary. The Bill was brought in at the end of February; since then for five months it had remained on some musty shelf at the Education Office, and now it was brought out after midnight in the last month of the session, although it was a most important Bill, containing some very excellent clauses and some most pernicious ones. Yet they were asked calmly to pass the Bill without any adequate or proper discussion. He thought the person who was really to be sympathised with now was the hon. Member for Scarborough, who got as far as the Report stage, a Bill which had the support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House. He moved one or two Amendments to it which were defeated, but on its broad principle he most cordially agreed with it. Why was not the hon. Member for Scarborough allowed to have his Bill starred?

MR. McKENNA: It was blocked by the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London.

MR. ASHLEY said the right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that if it had been starred as a Government Bill there would have been no difficulty. Owing to the difficulty which had arisen there was very great danger of its excellent provisions not being passed into law because of other provisions in this Bill. He really thought the conduct of this measure by the Government was one to be greatly deprecated by all who supported the Bill of the hon. Member for Scarborough. He did not know what the views of the hon. Member for Oxford University were with reference to Clause 4 (removal of the 2d. rate), but he had very strong objections to the removal of the 2d. rate. In this he was supported by numerous memorials which he had received from his constituents, and, therefore, he hoped if he objected to that clause the right hon. Gentlemen would give his constituents the same consideration that he was prepared to give to the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University. Far more important, however, than anything else was Clause 8, as to which he really wanted to know how they stood.

MR. McKENNA: It is dropped.

MR. ASHLEY said it was a very good thing too, because under Clause 8 he could not help thinking the right hon. Gentleman had absolute powers to alter the law at his own sweet will. He hoped the Bill would be given a Second Reading, although he thought they were discussing the subject under very unfavourable circumstances, and he hoped upstairs the objectionable provisions would be eliminated.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) thought the Member for Wigan had thrown oil on the troubled waters by his speech. Some of the difficulties raised by Members opposite against the Bill arose out of the working of the Act of 1902, for which the President of the Board of Education was not responsible. He thought there were a great many clauses in the present Bill which were admirable, but there was one clause which he looked on with considerable doubt, and he would like to have an assurance from the Government that in Committee they would add words to it which would be calculated to remove those doubts. Let them consider the history of the Education Acts for a moment. The Government first of all started the schools and then went a step further and made attendance compulsory. Then they went another step and provided food for the children attending. Now they went a step further still and provided medical attendance for these children. So they went step by step in the supersession of parents. His chief objection to the Bill was that it was a step in the direction of interfering with and superseding parents. However excellent and admirable the Educational Authorities might be he still believed in fathers and mothers and that with them should rest the management of the family. Many people with whom he had discussed this question thought that a great deal might be done to prevent the spread of infectious disease by the examination of children who were driven to school by the attendance officer. They were driven to school even if they were ill, and parents hesitated to withhold their children even if they were ill because of the prosecution which would follow. When the child was ill perhaps he suffered from an infectious disease to which children were liable. What was the remedy for that? It was to stop the compulsory attendance and leave it to the parents to decide. [Laughter.] Hon. Members laughed at anything like liberty. His constituents objected to compulsory attendance, and nothing would be more popular with the people of this country than its abolition. They knew what was good for them and they knew what was bad for them. Those who wanted education could get it, and those who did not want education in the schools ought to be allowed to stop away. There was another kind of education which could be got away from school. The question of medical attendance would be quite unnecessary if parents were allowed a little liberty to keep children away from school. It was the compulsion that made the difficulty. If he were a member of the Opposition he would only have to get the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for Oxford University to take the matter up and then he would be sure that the clause would be removed from the Bill, or would be slightly modified to suit him. At the present time his only hope was in the hon. Member for Glasgow University, who had expressed some objection to the clause. He hoped he would be able to bring pressure on the only man whom the President of the Board of Education had said he would listen to, and then the matter might be remedied. Sub-section (b) of Clause 10 of the Bill said there should be a duty on the local authority to provide medical inspection. Here they were superseding the local authority, which was not to decide whether or not it wanted to have medical inspection. Hon. Members were in favour of compulsion, not liberty. Here they were dealing with the sacred local authority which hon. Members supported, but still they were not to have liberty. All through the Bill of last year they were defending the liberty of the local authority, now they were taking it away. If the word "duty" were altered to the word "right" or "power" it would be less compulsory and he would not object to that part of the clause. The duty of the local authority was to provide for medical inspection of children. What did it mean? Some people would say that providing for medical inspection of children meant that children should be medically inspected, but he was told that that was not the meaning of the clause. It meant that the local authority should provide for the medical inspection of children, and that there should be a medical inspector, but that there was no power in the clause to compel the child to be medically inspected. Subject to the Board of Education, local authorities would have power to make any arrangement they liked for attending to the health and physical condition of the children. He would tell them what a medical man would be likely to say when he came to inspect the child. He would say "There has been a case of smallpox in the neighbouring village and I think that all the children in this school should be at once vaccinated."

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now introducing irrelevant matter.

*MR. LUPTON, continuing, said that in a school of 500 children the medical man might get £100 by vaccinating all of them, and this would be at the expense of the rates. He asked for an assurance from the President of the Board of Education that it was not intended to compel a child to be subject to any medical inspection or to any medical or surgical treatment without the consent of the parent or guardian of the child. [Cries of "Divide, divide."] He knew that Members did not want to hear him speak, but this was a Bill which would cause a great deal of anxiety to many people, and he knew its provisions would be very strongly criticised in the country. He had no doubt about this, and he thought the House should pause before it passed such a drastic clause. He asked that the right hon. Gentleman, who was very free with assurances that he did not intend to push certain clauses through, to give him an assurance that in Committee he would slightly modify this clause.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) said that Clause 3 as it stood at present was an absolute delusion and a sham. He said this advisedly because of the experiences gained in the past year by deputations to the Prime Minister and the President of the Board of Education. The deputation's views were received, as regarded the giving of this extended period, with favour, and with more than a half promise that their proposals should be considered, but when the Local Government Board was reached, that Department said "No, you shall only have the period of 30 years." It was perfectly clear that the Local Government Board had not the necessary confidence of the Board of Education, otherwise that Department would have said "What you recommend we will accept." He was quite sure that many hon. Members present had received from municipal reformers a request to take this matter up, that Clause 3 should be so amended that the opposition of the Local Government Board should prevail. He could say a great deal more on the matter, but he was sorry to see that the President of the Local Government Board was not present to take the matter up. He hoped that this point would be dealt with and that the clause would be modelled so that it should be a real benefit to municipalities and to counties, and not the delusion and sham that it was at present.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that one section of the community would be vitally affected by the Bill—the unfortunate ratepayers. If the Bill remained in its existing form the ratepayers would suffer to a very considerable extent. Clause 4 was a repudiation of a clause put into the Education Bill of the Government last year. That clause was never discussed in the House of Commons at all. He would only re-echo the protest of the hon. Member for Blackpool in urging that the clause should be deleted from this Bill, which was supposed to be a non-contentious measure. He hoped that the hon. Baronet below him would press for the deletion of the clause. Respecting Clause 10 he thought the general principle of the clause was agreed upon by both sides of the House, but he could not agree to its being imposed without some assistance being given from the general finances of the country. He could not conceive anything more likely to put the people of the country against education than continued appeals to pay for it out of the rates. The taxpayer at large approved of education, and did not object to further the cause of education by drinking a cup of tea or smoking a cigar, but the ratepayers did object to seeing the education rate continually on the increase. He uttered a protest against continual duties being imposed on educational authorities without some help from the Exchequer.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) expressed regret that the Government had not starred the Bill of the hon. Member for Scarborough.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed to a Standing Committee.

EVIDENCE (COLONIAL STATUTES) BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee) considered:

Amendments proposed:—

"In page 1, lines 5 and 6, to leave out the words 'other instruments having statutory force passed, issued, or made,' and to insert the words 'statutes passed.'"

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the words 'or under the authority of.'"

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'possession,' to insert the words 'and of orders, regulations, and other instruments issued or made, whether before or after the passing of this Act, under the authority of any such Act, ordinance, or statute.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. BOWLES moved an Amendment to add in line 8, after the word "desertion," the words "and an authentic copy of which shall have been transferred by the Governor to one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State." These words, he said, had been copied from an Act of 1842, relating to New South Wales. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1., line 8, after the word 'desertion' to insert the words 'and an authentic copy of which shall have been transferred by the Governor to one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.) said that, following to some extent the principle adopted by the Foreign Office in respect of the statutes of foreign countries, he was anxious to take a similar responsibility for the Colonial Office for the simplification of the acceptance of statutes, but he was informed that it would lead to a number of complications. If there were no other way of obtaining the end they had in view it would be necessary to adopt the course; but by the measures proposed in the Bill it was hoped to obtain all the facilities desired without involving the Colonial Office in an unlimited amount of trouble.

MR. BOWLES asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'possession,' to insert the words 'and of orders, regulations, and other instruments issued or made, whether before or after the passing of this Act, under the authority of any such Act, ordinance, or statute.'"

"In line 12, after the word 'copy,' to insert the words 'or pretended copy.'"

"In line 12, after the word 'ordinance,' to insert the words 'statute, order, regulation.'"

"In lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'copy of any such Act, ordinance, or instrument,' and insert the words 'such copy or pretended copy.'"

"In line 17, to leave out the words 'be guilty of felony and.'"

"In line 18, to leave out the words 'penal servitude for a period not exceeding five years' and insert the words 'imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding twelve months.'"—(*Mr. Churchill.*)

Amendments agreed to.

MR. BOWLES moved to leave out the words "purporting to be the printer." He said the object of this Bill was to remove doubt concerning the validity of Colonial Statutes which it might be desired to use as evidence in British Courts of law. The Bill proposed that any copy of a Colonial Statute produced in Court here should be accepted at once as evidence if it purported to be printed by the Government printer. Therefore the question as to who was the Government printer was at the bottom of the whole Bill. Was the Government printer under the Bill the printer who was authorised by the Government of the Colony to print it? Not at all—that would be simple. The Government printer for the purpose of this Act was the printer who purported to be the printer authorised. It was quite evident that there might be very serious conflict. Unless the words were to be read entirely out of the ordinary sense they made utter nonsense so far as the practical effect of the Bill was concerned. Under subsection 2 of Clause 1 a penalty was imposed upon a man who printed a copy of the Act which falsely purported to have been printed by a printer who purported, whether falsely or not, to be the printer authorised by the Government of the Colony to print the Statute. It was a fantastic offence and he really thought the words must have been put in by some oversight, as they were plainly ridiculous.

MR. ASHLEY seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, lines 21 and 22, to leave out the words 'purporting to be the printer.'" (*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. CHURCHILL said the hon. Member, like himself, was not a lawyer, and therefore he was sure the hon. Member would not be surprised if he said he fully sympathised with the anxiety which the phrasing of the provision had caused him. It undoubtedly did appear to be very involved, complicated, and ineffective phrasing. He would, however, hesitate to say anything that appeared in the slightest degree to be disrespectful to the sober language of the Law Courts, for the definition was taken textually *mutatis mutandis* from the definition in the Documentary Evidence Act. The point was not so obscure as it might at first appear. The purpose of this Bill was to provide a smooth, easy, method of proving Colonial Statutes as evidence in British Courts. If they were to say that the printer should be the printer authorised to print the Act, it would be open to an ingenious counsel to argue that it was necessary to prove who was the Government printer, and then the whole trouble which this Bill sought to avoid would be retained. Once the word "purporting" appeared it did not matter whether the printer was authorised to print or not; all that was necessary was that he was the printer purporting to be the printer authorised. In every respect this measure conformed entirely to the regulations, and although he admitted the words had not great literary sparkle he trusted the hon. Gentleman would accept them.

MR. BOWLES said he did not desire to interfere with the passage of the Bill, and would therefore ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

AUSTRALIAN STATES CONSTITUTION BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

Clause 1:—

MR. ASHLEY opposed the clause, for the purpose of asking what sort of Bills would be reserved. Would a Bill, for example, passed by one of the States for excluding Japanese from entering be one to be reserved?

MR. CHURCHILL said the necessity for this measure arose from the fact that under various Acts dating from the early part of the late reign certain classes of legislation had been reserved, and had to be referred home. One of the principal classes was in cases affecting constitutional changes, which should be a matter always reserved for the sanction of His Majesty's Government. The Committee would see that, as time went on, changes of a kind which were not really fundamental to the constitution of the Colonies were made in the ordinary expansion of their electoral position There was a Bill affecting the alteration of the franchise, and the system of election, and these purely local measures had come to be withheld as if they were affecting the constitution of the State. This caused a great deal of inconvenience and difficulty. This Bill dealt with the whole principle of reserving Bills from the Australian Colonies and it agreed exactly with the views that the Colonies now held. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would not think he was disrespectful if he said it was absolutely necessary for the Bill that he should obtain it in the form in which it now stood, because it was in that form that it had been agreed to after an immense amount of time and trouble by the whole of the self-governing States of Australia. There would still be certain fundamental Bills which would necessarily be referred home, such as Bills altering the constitution of the legislature in either House, or affecting the salary of the Governor, or a Bill which was, under any act of legislature of the State, prescribed to be reserved. These might appear to be very considerable reservations for them to make upon the legislation of the self-governing Colonies. He did not say anything in defence of it except that the Bill had been agreed to after very long consideration by the Colonies concerned.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) said the right hon. Gentleman had made an exceedingly interesting reply, but he had not answered the question whether or not under the Bill the question of legislation affecting the landing of Japanese or other coloured labour would be reserved. He rather gathered that that would not come within the limit of the Bills necessarily reserved, but would probably come under those Bills which would, under the direction of the Government at home to the Colonial Governor, be reserved.

MR. CHURCHILL replied that under instructions the Colonial Governor might refer such Bills home, but as to any particular Bill he could not say without inquiry, because instructions varied.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

MR. FORSTER asked for information as to a reference in the clause regarding certain Colonial Bills which were required to be laid before both Houses of Parliament in England.

MR. CHURCHILL said the clause was intended to be a wide net to validate illegalities in Bills passed by the Australian Colonies. This particular clause referred, he believed, to Tasmania, Western Australia, and Queensland, the reserved Bills from which had to lie on the Table of both Houses for thirty days before they obtained the force of law. The clause was put in in order that any Bills which had not conformed to this rule should not be invalidated.

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment.

Read a third time, and passed.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1905–6.

Resolutions reported :—

1. Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Navy Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those Services, but that, as shown in the schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows viz. :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - -	455,264	18	4
Total Deficits - -	217,505	19	2
Net Surplus -	£237,758	19	2

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services be sanctioned.

1. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

Schedule.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1905–6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1	Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines -	—			163,909	1	8
2	Victualling and Clothing for the Navy -	18,072	14	10	—		
3	Medical Establishments and Services -	12,042	10	4	—		
4	Martial Law - - - - - -	720	19	6	—		
5	Educational Services - - - - -	10,824	8	0	—		
6	Scientific Services - - - - - -	—			3,782	10	4
7	Royal Naval Reserves - - - - -	35,539	13	0	—		
8	Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c.:						
	I. Personnel - - - - -	63,015	9	2	—		
	II. Matériel - - - - - -	11,824	16	1	—		
	III. Contract Work- - - -	46,417	6	4	—		
9	Naval Armaments - - - - - -	127,868	17	7	—		
10	Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad- - - - - - -	106,664	13	1	—		
11	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	17,471	4	2	—		
12	Admiralty Office - - - - - -	—			5,800	14	1
13	Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay -	—			31,897	17	8
14	Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances - -	4,802	6	3	—		
15	Civil Pensions and Gratuities - - -	—			9,550	10	4
—	Amount written off as irrecoverable -	—			2,565	5	1
	Total - - -	455,264	18	4	217,505	19	2
	Net Surplus -	£237,758	19	2			

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) said he ventured respectfully to protest against this very important Resolution being taken at this hour in the morning. He thanked the Chancellor of the Exchequer for having taken what he believed was a perfectly constitutional step in asking the Public Accounts Committee to consider in a new and revised form, not only the Appropriation Account but also the form in which the Account was placed before the House. But at that hour it was impossible that the House could discuss the matter properly. He hoped next year the Government would arrange matters in a way which would afford opportunity for criticising the Resolution. He did not know what arrangements had been come to, but perhaps this Resolution could be taken to-morrow.

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) said the resolution was taken by agreement with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Somerset, and he saw no need to depart from that agreement.

Mr. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury) said the right hon. Gentlemen himself was responsible for exactly the same procedure when Secretary to the Treasury in 1905. He found, by reference to *Hansard*, that the Resolution was taken after midnight on that occasion.

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) pressed on the Government that a day and not a night should be given to the Public Accounts Committee Report.

II. Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ending 31st March, 1906, and the statement appended thereto, that the aggregate expenditure on Army Services has not exceeded the aggregate sums appropriated for those services, but that, as shown in the Schedule hereto appended, the total differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses - -	1,396,005	1	10
Total Deficits - -	61,868	4	0
Net Surplus -	£1,334,136	17	10

And whereas it is expedient that the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services be sanctioned.

2. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Army Services, 1905–6. Votes.	Differences between Exchequer Grants and Net Expenditure.					
		Surpluses.			Deficits.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1	Pay, &c., of Army - - - - - -	256,166	18	10	—		
2	Medical Establishment: Pay, &c. - -	25,504	11	11	—		
3	Militia: Pay, Bounty, &c. - - - -	66,162	14	8	—		
4	Imperial Yeomanry: Pay and Allowances	40,604	8	11	—		
5	Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances -	—			613	19	1
6	Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts -	187,279	4	7	—		
7	Supplies and Clothing - - - - -	415,222	14	10	—		
8	Ordnance Department Establishments and General Stores - - - - - -	122,089	1	7	—		
9	Armaments and Engineer Stores - -	100,865	18	11	—		
10	Works and Buildings - - - - -	155,563	4	9	—		
11	Establishments for Military Education -	7,038	12	2	—		
12	Miscellaneous Effective Services - -	7,910	10	0	—		
13	War Office and Army Accounts Department - - - - - - - - -	—			3,936	14	1
14	Non-effective Charges for Officers, &c. -	11,597	0	8	—		
15	Non-effective Charges for Men, &c. - -	—			41,452	12	3
16	Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, & Gratuities	—			6,428	3	9
—	Balances irrecoverable - - - - -	—			9,436	14	10
	Total - - - -	1,396,005	1	10	61,868	4	0
	Net Surplus -	£1,334,136	17	10			

Resolution agreed to.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at six minutes before Three o'clock, a.m

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 1st *August*, 1907.

The Right Honourable Sir James Kitson, Baronet, having been created Baron Airedale of Gledhow, in the West Riding of the county of York, was in the usual manner introduced.

Sir Montagu Samuel Montagu, Baronet, having been created Baron Swaythling of Swaythling, in the county of Southampton, was in the usual manner introduced.

Sir James Blyth, Baronet, having been created Baron Blyth of Blythwood, in the county of Essex, was in the usual manner introduced.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Money) Bill Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.] Commons' Amendments to be considered on Monday next.

Australian States Constitution Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Confirmation (London No. 1.) Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2.) Bill [H.L.] Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4.) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Co-operation Bill; South Wales Mineral Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4.) Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] Commons' Amendments considered (on Motion), and agreed to.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10.) Bill—(Bradford (Yorks) Order). Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Craven be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Duke of Sutherland; read and agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.]; Commons' Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

ARMAGH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Order of the Day read for resuming the adjourned debate on Amendment moved after Third Reading.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I do not know whether it would be convenient that I should first of all make a statement with regard to this Amendment. I should like to say that I am grateful for the consideration which the House showed us in allowing this matter to be postponed until to-day. On Monday when it came before the House I was certainly not very well posted in the facts with regard to it. I am not going to make any apology for that, because I think it would have been very difficult for me to have foretold that on the Amendment of the noble Earl, Lord Donoughmore, to leave out part of a clause in an unopposed Bill, charges of political jobbery and corruption were about to be made. I confess that when first my attention was drawn to it it appeared rather a trivial matter—a parochial matter, I might say—and not one of very great importance. However the action of Lord Donoughmore has given it a considerable degree of importance, because he has asserted that the clause as introduced in this Bill was a rather glaring instance of political jobbery.

I was unable on Monday, when the matter was before the House, to express any opinion on this point, and I was very chary of doing so, for I am aware that there have been a good many cases, since the Act of Union, of political jobbery in Ireland; but I am now in a position to give definite information on the matter. But before I do so I should like to define what the position of the Government with regard to this matter is. This is a private Bill. It is the result of an arrangement between two parties. As such it is not the actual concern of the Government. The Government are indirectly concerned in it because the matter has come before the Vice-President of the Local Government Board of Ireland in a certain capacity. I will deal with that point later. But it is not our business to be responsible for measures of this kind, and the concern of the Government, so far as it is concerned, is mainly to see that justice is done between the different parties to the arrangement; and if, in spite of the investigations of the Committee before whom this Bill went in the other House—I presume it was fought by counsel—political jobbery or something of that kind is contemplated under this particular clause, I am sure that noble Lords on this side of the House are just as anxious as any noble Lord belonging to the Party opposite that such a possibility should be averted. Since Monday I have endeavoured to obtain all the information with regard to this matter. I have seen the promoters of the Bill; I have seen the Vice-President of the Local Government Board of Ireland, and also the Chairman of the Police and Sanitary Committee of the House of Commons, before which Committee this Bill went.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I think the only point between us is this proviso, which has been introduced since the Bill reached your Lordships' House—the proviso was not in the Bill when it was before the House of Commons.

LORD DENMAN: I agree that it has been introduced since the Bill left the House of Commons. But I thought I would see the Chairman of the Police and Sanitary Committee in the other House to inquire what his views of the matter were. From what I have been able to ascertain I have come to the conclusion that it would be unfair to describe the insertion of this clause as a political job or anything in the nature of a political job. I understand that the charge which is made is two-fold. First of all, it is asserted that under the latter part of this clause the town clerk of Armagh receives practically a tenure for life. If you will glance at the clause you will see that that is not the case. It says that he shall hold the said office until he die, or resign, or be removed by the council with the assent of the Board—that is to say, with the assent of the Local Government Board. Therefore, in case of any misconduct, the Town Council of Armagh would bring the matter before the Local Government Board of Ireland, and that Board would certainly take such action as they deemed fit.

But the more serious charge, I think, was this. It was said, "Why do you put this particular clerk in a different position from that which most of the town clerks of Ireland enjoy?" The answer is really a very simple one. He is placed in this position because under this Bill you put upon him new duties, and to a certain extent these new duties are invidious duties and such as would be likely to bring him in conflict with his fellow townsmen. Some of his new duties, for instance, will be under the Public Health Act, and for all practical purposes he will be in the position of a sanitary officer. Under the general law of Ireland a sanitary officer does receive almost the exact protection which it is proposed to afford to the town clerk of this district. This official's duties will be two-fold. He will have to perform the duties of town clerk and also the duties of a sanitary officer, and if sanitary officers generally are protected by the law of Ireland surely it is only fair and reasonable that this town clerk should be protected on account of the duties he may have to perform as a sanitary officer.

There is ample precedent for such a course being taken with regard to sanitary officers. It is, as I have said, the usual course, and I will proceed to quote what the precedents are. The tenure of sanitary officers is regulated by Section XI. of the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878, and the Local Government Board have made orders under that section, the last of which are dated May 3rd, 1900, under which no sanitary inspector can be removed except by or with the consent of the Local Government Board. Then there are many other precedents almost identically similar, or, at any rate, analogous to this particular one. For example, Section 83 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, provides that no secretary to a county council and no county surveyor shall be removed from office without the consent of the Local Government Board; under Section 33 of the Poor Relief (Ireland) Act, 1838. Poor Law officers can only be removed by or with the consent of the Local Government Board; and there are also precedents with regard to English local government. Section 119 of the English Local Government Act, 1888, provides that no officer transferred to a county council can be removed without the consent of the Secretary of State or the Local Government Board, and that such consent shall be part of the tenure of his office. Then, again, subsection 18 of Section 115 of the Act which established county councils in Ireland—the Act of 1898—provides that every existing officer transferred under the section shall hold his office under the same terms and conditions as heretofore. Then there is another case—I do not quote it as a precedent in any way—in which there is a certain analogy to what it is proposed to do under this Bill. There is a Committee, of which, I think, the noble Earl, Lord Donoughmore, is the chairman, sitting at present in the Committee Rooms of this House——

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: No.

LORD DENMAN: Then I have been misinformed on that point, and I will not refer to it further. But quite the most striking point with regard to this is that identically the same thing as it is proposed to enact in this Bill has been enacted before—namely, in 1896. I should like to read the particular clause—

> "The clerks and other officers of the Commissioners holding office at the passing of this Act shall continue to hold the office......and while performing duties similar to those which they have previously discharged, shall receive not less salary or remuneration......and shall not be dismissed from their offices without the sanction of the Lord-Lieutenant."

That applies to the town clerk of Armagh who was appointed in or before the year 1896, and if you substitute the Local Government Board, as is proposed in this instance, for the Lord-Lieutenant, you have an almost exactly similar case. There is this difference, that in the year 1896 there was a Unionist majority on the council of Armagh and there was a Unionist Government in power; but it seems to me that if it was right to do this particular thing in 1896, surely it must be equally right to do it at the present day.

On Monday last, Lord Donoughmore asserted that the clerk who was appointed in or before the year 1896 had been hounded out of his office, I think he said, by the Nationalist majority on the council. I have good authority—I have not sifted the authority, but it is good authority—for believing that the noble Earl has been misinformed on that point. What happened, as I understand, was this. The former clerk, who was a man of considerable age and was protected by the Act of 1896 in almost the identical manner in which it is proposed to protect the present clerk, served under successive councils up to the end of 1903. He wished to resign sometime previous, but was concerned as to the amount of his pension. He served under the council with a Nationalist majority from 1899 to 1903; and he was perfectly satisfied with the pension which the present council gave him. He was over 70 years of age when he gave in his resignation, and I am informed that it is incorrect to state that he was hounded out of office. But suppose he was? Surely that is an argument that cuts both ways, because if in Armagh it is the custom of a majority on the council immediately to worry out all the officials who were appointed by their predecessors, it is obviously very necessary indeed that you should give protection in this particular manner.

I pass on to another point. This matter came before the Vice-President of the Local Government Board of Ireland and he gave his assent to it. I do not suppose for a moment that any noble Lord from Ireland would allege that the Vice-President would be a party to a political job or to favouritism of the character suggested. I do not think that would be suggested for a moment. This clause was sent to his office; he considered the matter and the clause was to a considerable extent redrafted in his office with his sanction and approval; and I do not think that the Vice-President of the Local Government Board would have given his approval unless he had considered that it was a fair and proper provision to insert in an Act of Parliament. I also have to cite the fact that this particular clause was considered by the Urban District Council of Armagh and was approved unanimously by them, and I should have thought that if there had been opposition to it that opposition would certainly have made itself heard. I also cannot understand why, if this were an undesirable thing to introduce, the matter was not brought before a Select Committee of your Lordships' House and thrashed out in the Committee Rooms upstairs, which I submit is the proper place for the discussion of a parochial matter of this kind, rather than in the body of the House.

To sum up briefly the points which I have endeavoured to make, I think I have shown—and this is, after all, the principal point—first, that having been appointed sanitary officer it was surely reasonable to give this clerk the protection which it is customary by the law of Ireland to give to sanitary officers in similar positions; secondly, that the previous clerk was given practically the same tenure of office as it is proposed to give the present man, although in his case he was not called upon to perform some of the invidious duties which I understand the present town clerk will, by reason of this Bill, have to discharge; thirdly, that the assent of the Local Government Board of Ireland was obtained and that this clause had the approval of the Vice-President of that body, who assisted in the drafting of the clause; and, fourthly, that if there is such a strong case to be made out against the clause it ought to have been heard in a Committee Room upstairs.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: There was no chance.

LORD DENMAN: With regard to Lord Donoughmore's accusations, I do not, of course, know from what source his information comes. Possibly he has more evidence which he will give to the House to show that this was a job of a political character, and, if so, we shall, of course, give our earnest attention to what he has to say in that respect. But from what I have been able to find out, it seems to me that this is rather in the nature of a mare's-nest and that the noble Earl has been misinformed in the matter. It is a truism that all great men have their enemies, and it is perfectly possible that some opponent, political or otherwise, of the town clerk of the urban district council of Armagh may have obtained the ear of the noble Earl, and that he may have been misinformed on this point. But from the evidence I have obtained it does seem to me that there is a good case for the insertion of this clause in the Bill, and I would ask the noble Earl either to produce some new facts which we have not heard or to withdraw his Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, this is an adjourned debate on a matter upon which both the noble Lord who has just sat down and myself have already spoken, and therefore, except with the leave of the House, I do not think that either of us is entirely in order in again addressing you on the subject. I was not aware that the noble Lord was going to make a prolonged explanation of the attitude of the Government of Ireland, because I was anxious as early as possible to say that, having looked into the matter with some care since the debate on Monday, doubts have arisen in my mind whether your Lordships ought not to order that this clause should go to the Examiners of Standing Orders. The noble Lord quoted the opinion of the Chairman of the Police and Sanitary Committee of the House of Commons, and also stated that, in his opinion, if the question was to be raised at all, it ought to have been raised on petition, and should have gone to a Committee of your Lordships' House for consideration. The facts are these. The Bill, having been considered by the House of Commons, came up to your Lordships' House, and the parties who are interested were wholly in ignorance of the fact that the clause in question was going to be proposed here. The Bill went before the Unopposed Bill Committee. The clause was not opposed by the Local Government Board for Ireland; I was informed that it had received the unanimous approval of the Armagh Urban District Council, and therefore the clause was inserted in the Bill. But no opportunity was afforded to the Examiners to consider whether the Standing Orders had been complied with, and after careful inquiry I am of opinion that your Lordships would be well advised, before proceeding further in the matter, to order that it should be referred to the Examiners to see whether the Standing

Orders have been complied with, as to which there is, in my mind, some doubt. I beg to move in that sense.

Moved, "That the Bill be referred to the Examiners to report whether the Standing Orders have been complied with in respect of the Amendments made in Committee of this House."—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

LEITH BURGH ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, I beg to move that this Bill be read a third time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

***LORD SALTOUN:** My Lords, I have placed on the Paper Notice of mv intention, on the Motion for the Third Reading, to move that the Bill be read a third time this day three months, and I should like to explain to your Lordships my reasons for moving this Amendment and the position of the Leith Dock Corporation. In the first place, the Leith Dock Corporation have been exempted from various assessments under an Act of 1848, and in subsequent Acts these exemptions have always been continued. In the next place, the Leith Dock Corporation is not in the same position as the other dock undertakings which were compared with it at the time of the inquiry—docks such as Grangemouth, because those are docks which belong to railway companies and earn a revenue to pay the shareholders. The Leith Dock Corporation is in an entirely different position, because it is simply a public concern under trustees or commissioners, and can only use surplus revenue for the purposes of dock works. Therefore they are not all on the same footing as revenue-earning concerns.

Leith has never subscribed or contributed a single penny towards either the formation of the docks or any of the works which the docks have undertaken. The docks do their own policing and also undertake the cleansing and keeping up of their streets within their gates, and they also keep up two and a half miles of streets outside the docks. They have to pay entirely for this out of dock revenue, and the cost is about £11,500. They also pay the poor and school rates, property and income-tax, and for public health—in all, about £23,000, including the £11,500 to which I have referred. They have also a yearly servitude of about £11,000 in redemption of debt. It has been stated that the dock revenue is nearer £50,000 than £30,000, but I am informed that the surplus revenue is only now £23,000 per annum, and for many years cannot possibly be in any way increased. The docks are about to raise a loan of £120,000. I believe they have been forced to hang it up in consequence of the decision given by the Joint Committee in Edinburgh in April. I have briefly mentioned the position of the dock corporation.

The whole Bill was unanimously approved, with the exception of Clause 4—the rating clause. A Member of the House of Commons who was on the Joint Committee and myself were of one opinion, and a noble Member of your Lordships' House and the Chairman were of the other opinion; and it seemed to me for many reasons that if any decision should have been given it should have been that the *status quo ante* should be preserved. I do not wish to suggest any wrong-doing on the part of the Chairman—he is a most upright and honourable gentleman—but the Chairman gave his casting vote for the assessment of the docks for the rates. The result of that decision was that half the rates were put on; that is to say, they were assessed on half the value instead of the whole. It seems to me that this is a matter of principle. If it was just to make the assessment at all, it ought to have been made on the whole; and if it was just that the exemption should be continued, it ought to have been continued on the whole. That, I take it, is the position.

If the case had come before a Private Bill Committee of the House of Commons, as it used to do in the old days before these Joint Committees were set up, and the finding had been one way, and it had then gone to a Private Bill Committee of the House of Lords and the finding had been the same, both Houses would probably have accepted that decision. But in this important matter, involving a very considerable sum of money and an important principle, the decision was given by the Chairman of the Committee, and in absolute contradiction of all the former Acts which had been passed continuing the exemptions to the corporation. It seemed to me, from that, that there was a most excellent reason for re-hearing this case, but that was refused in the House of Commons, and I can see no other way of bringing this to your Lordships' notice than by moving the rejection of the Bill on Third Reading. I would point out that it was merely the accident of this gentleman happening to be Chairman. If I or the Member of the House of Commons who held the same view as I held had been Chairman, the decision would have been exactly opposite. Therefore, I do not think a decision arrived at in these circumstances should be allowed to pass your Lordships' House, but that some steps should be taken by which the whole of this Bill could be reconsidered. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment moved, "To leave out the word 'now' in order to add at the end the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Lord Saltoun.*)

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, the course which the House is asked to follow is, no doubt, a very unusual one. It is one which it is perfectly competent for the House to follow if it thinks it expedient to do so, but I venture to say it should not be done without the most weighty and the gravest possible reasons. The noble Lord who has moved the rejection of the Bill served as one of the Commissioners who inquired into this matter in Edinburgh, and he has no doubt formed a very strong opinion as to the merits of the case after hearing the evidence. I have had the privilege of sitting on a Committee of your Lordships' House with the noble Lord, and I can bear testimony, if such were needed, to the weight and value that must attach to an opinion which he forms under such circumstances. But I feel that it is not necessary for me to do this, and indeed I feel sure that whatever method your Lordships may select for settling a difficult matter of this sort the very last one which would be likely to commend itself to you would be that there should be a public weighing of the relative value of the opinion of the different Commissioners.

Now, what are the reasons which the noble Lord gives for moving the rejection of this Bill? First of all, because the docks are the property of commissioners and not of a private company. I confess that I see no reason in that to justify his proposal. These docks are certainly the property of commissioners, and it may be presumed that the town of Leith, in which they are situated, would not wish to injure them because the whole prosperity of the town is bound up in the docks. Then the noble Lord referred to the casting vote of the Chairman. I would remind the House that these Commissions consist of four members—two from your Lordships' House and two from the other House. It is, of course, obvious that in these circumstances there is always the possibility of their being equally divided on any question, and it was for that reason that the Chairman was given a casting vote in the Scottish Private Bill Procedure Act. Having been given that vote by Parliament, I presume it was intended that the Chairman should exercise it, and that a decision arrived at in that way should have just the same force and value as a decision arrived at in any other way.

Then the noble Lord said that if the assessment was to be imposed at all, it should be a full one; that it should either be a full one or none at all. In answer to that, I would point out that it is a very common thing for docks to be rated at half the total value. There are a great many cases in various parts of the country. The next reason the noble Lord gave was that no appeal had been allowed. I would remind the House that the ordinary procedure has been followed in this case. Under the Act which regulates these matters an opportunity of asking that the matter shall be referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses is given in the House in which the matter originates, and that in this case was the other House of Parliament. Such a Motion was made in the other House, and was, after a very full discussion, defeated by a large majority.

So that I do not think it can be said that the procedure has not been followed to the letter in this case.

This matter raises the question of this particular procedure in relation to Scottish Bills. I speak with great deference on that subject in the presence of the noble Lord who was the father of that measure; but I see that when the Glasgow Corporation Police Order was under discussion in this House in 1901 the noble Lord said that if continual appeals were made the object of that Act would be defeated. The noble Lord pointed out that the Act was passed with the object of reducing expense, and that if continual appeals were granted these matters would be made very much more expensive than they were before. I therefore ask the House not to agree to the Amendment of the noble Lord.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I venture to suggest to the House that if we do not take care we shall drift into rather a difficult position in regard to this matter. We have had two speeches considerably directed towards the merits of the particular Bill before us. Perhaps under the circumstances that was unavoidable, but in my opinion it is very unfortunate. I do not think there can be a worse result of any procedure than that there should be discussions on the merits of private Bills in the House as a whole. The facts before us, which are without dispute, are that certain very material interests are involved in this question, and that the decision upon one of those was arrived at by the casting vote of the Chairman. That fact was announced by the Chairman himself at the moment he gave the decision. I suggest that under these circumstances it would have been very much better if every effort had been taken to procure a re-hearing under the machinery of the Act under which this inquiry was held.

The noble Lord in charge of the Bill says that the ordinary procedure has been followed; but the ordinary procedure has been varied in recent years. Under the machinery of the Act it is only the House of origination which can order the new inquiry, but the obvious intention of the Act was that the question should be decided ministerially as to which House should be the House of origination. The difficulty in which we are placed is the same as that in which we were placed last year. Last year, in the case of another Order, a decision was given which it became perfectly patent was contrary to justice, and under pressure from this House a compromise was arrived at between the parties. The suggestion I make now is that this debate should be adjourned for the purpose of seeing whether some compromise in the matter cannot still be arranged. The parties on both sides must know the merits and where the truth between them lies. Here we cannot judge upon *ex parte* statements from one side or the other, made in however good faith. The only manner in which these things can be tested is on oath before a Committee upstairs. That we are precluded from in this case.

I suggest to the Government that if they do not take more care and sometimes give this House an opportunity of judging whether there should be a re-hearing or not, they will break down the whole system which was brought into force under the Private Bill Procedure Act. The idea of that Act was that there should be a re-hearing when it was demanded by either party, but under the obligation that if they failed the second time they should be cast in costs. That would have been a salutary rule, but it was not the shape in which the Bill passed. The Act was passed under the presumption that the Scottish Office would act ministerially in the matter, and hold the balance fairly between both parties. I have watched the procedure for the last two or three years, and I have observed that in every case at least where opposition or a demand for a further hearing is expected, and where a municipal authority has been a party to a Bill, that Bill has originated in the other House of Parliament; and on one occasion, although the question that was involved touched a somewhat obscure municipality in Lanarkshire, circulars were sent by municipal bodies all over England to their representatives begging them to vote in a particular way. If that is to go on it will destroy the procedure under that Act, because it will destroy confidence in it, and the larger matters which have hitherto been conducted under these inquiries will not be sent to them. Parties will object to very large interests being decided on the casting vote of a Chairman, however able, without there being an opportunity of appeal. I venture most respectfully to suggest that we had better adjourn this discussion for two or three days in the hope of some adjustment being arrived at. I see an Amendment on the Paper in the name of Lord Plymouth to leave out Clause 4. I do not know whether that is a matter of compromise or arrangement. But I venture to suggest, however well intentioned we may be sitting in the Whole House, we shall run great risk of doing injustice to one side or the other unless we give further opportunity for conference and compromise.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): My Lords, I certainly agree with the noble Lord who has just spoken that it is most desirable not to discuss the merits on a point of this kind, and I have no intention of doing so. But with regard to the question of the casting vote of the Chairman, the noble Lord, with his greater knowledge of the matter, will perfectly well remember that that is a provision of the Act itself, and no doubt was introduced, necessarily introduced, in consequence of the Commission consisting only of four members. I should imagine that the casting vote of the Chairman was not expected to be used very frequently, and certainly not frequently in such a case as this; but I think it must be acknowledged that in exercising it the Chairman of this Commission only performed what was his duty, and therefore that the decision of the Commission, so far as it depended on the casting vote of the Chairman, must be held to have been a valid and effectual decision. I do not say that it is the most satisfactory way of arriving at a conclusion, and I am confirmed in that by the remark which was made by the noble Lord who moved the Amendment, and who said distinctly that if he had been Chairman the decision would have been the other way. I do not think that indicates a very satisfactory state of matters.

I wish to say a word with regard to the remarks of my noble friend as to the House of origination. That is a matter of arrangement, no doubt, but I hope he will disabuse his mind of any impression that there has been any desire on the part of my right hon. friend the Secretary for Scotland to introduce the Bill in any other way than that which was most convenient for discussion. It is obvious that, being on the authority of the Minister, it is most desirable that the Bill should be introduced as a rule in the House in which that Minister sits; but I have the authority of my right hon. friend for saying that he quite recognises that Bills ought also to be introduced into this House, and that if there is a desire that that should be done more frequently he is perfectly willing to take that into account.

After all, there have only been, before this Bill, I think, four other Bills in which this question has arisen, and of those one was introduced in this House during the time my noble friend was Secretary for Scotland. I only mention that to show that not very many cases have originated altogether, and, although the majority have originated in the other House, I do not think there is any justification for an assertion that there is any disposition to override the convenience or wishes of your Lordships' House. With regard to the suggestion which my noble friend made, we are quite ready, if the House desires it, to adjourn this discussion for further conference. I do not think that we can undertake to set up a Committee.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: You cannot.

THE EARL OF ELGIN: But if my noble friend wishes the debate adjourned for futher conference we will not object.

LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, there is another question connected with this Bill on which I should like to say a word. This is a private Bill, but it proceeds to override several public Acts. The exemptions in respect of the Leith Docks were given by the Act of 1870, and by the Burgh Police (Scotland) Acts of 1893 and 1895. Your Lordships have always held that it is extremely undesirable in a private Bill to override the provisions of public Acts. I had the opportunity of bringing this very point before your Lordships in the case of the

South Eastern Railway and some of the other railways in the borough of Woolwich. It was proposed in a private Bill to take away from them exemptions which had been given in public Acts, and when the matter came before this House your Lordships agreed that this was undesirable and struck out the clause on the ground that a private Bill ought not to interfere with a public Act. It appears to me that this is a case on the same footing. I can quite understand that it may be inconvenient to adopt the Amendment of Lord Saltoun and throw out the Bill on Third Reading; but I think there is strong reason why your Lordships should be consistent and do in respect of this Bill what you did in regard to the Woolwich Bill—namely, after Third Reading accept the Amendment of the noble Earl on the Front Opposition Bench and delete the clause which repeals the existing exemptions of the Dock Commissioners from assessments.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I understand the proposal to be that this debate should be adjourned in the hope that some arrangement may be come to between the parties. The noble Lord may have better information on the subject than I have, but I understand that negotiations have taken place, but that so far they have not shown any sign of fruition. I shall not oppose the adjournment of the debate if your Lordships think fit that that course should be adopted, but I would point out that there are really two questions involved. The first is whether these Dock Commissioners should be exempted from local rates. You cannot possibly decide that question without referring the matter to a Committee, and this you are precluded from doing in this case owing to circumstances which have been explained. If your Lordships were to decide either to throw out this Bill or to adopt the Amendment which is on the Paper in the name of my noble friend Lord Plymouth, I think you could only do so upon the ground that in your opinion a re-hearing of the case ought to be had. That re-hearing cannot take place under existing circumstances, because the House in which the Bill originated has decided that it will not refer the Bill to a Joint Committee. I greatly deplore the fact that a re-hearing cannot be had in this case. I do not base that on the fact that the decision was arrived at by the casting vote of the Chairman, because that has been fully provided for in the Scottish Private Bill Procedure Act. No doubt under many circumstances it would be right; but in this particular case there has been a battle going on for something like twenty years, and an appeal has been made to Parliament four times without success. On the fifth occasion when it is made, the point is decided only on the casting vote of the Chairman. Upon the merits of this case I say nothing, but I maintain that it is a misfortune that when a case of this kind, which has been protracted over many years, is decided in this way, there should be no means—and there are no means—available to your Lordships to have a re-hearing. I hope your Lordships will not agree to the Motion of Lord Saltoun, and I think you could only adopt the Amendment of Lord Plymouth upon the broad and general grounds that it was desirable to have a re-hearing, and not because you wished to pronounce any opinion on the merits of the Bill.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, there is a provision in the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, which entirely meets my noble friend Lord Avebury's contention. In Section 373 of that Act the words appear—

> "Unless and until such exemption is repealed by Provisional Order confirmed by Parliament."

So that the course which is taken now is exactly the one which was contemplated by the Act of 1892. I hope this Bill will be allowed to pass in its present form. I, too, do not wish to go into the details of the Bill, but I think a good general principle is that bodies and corporations such as the Leith Dock Commissioners should pay their fair share of the rates of the district in which they are. But in this particular instance the case is a very peculiar one locally. From the time of the establishment of this corporation in 1867 up to the year 1905—that is, for thirty-eight years—the dock corporation paid the public health rate regularly every year, and it was not until there was a decision given in a case at Greenock in 1905, that the dock commissioners ceased to pay this contribution to the public health rates; and in these two years they have escaped a payment of some £4,000. In the Bill it is proposed to leave that exemption open up to the year 1908, so that at any rate for three years the Leith Docks Corporation will be exempted from paying what I think really ought to fall on such a body as that. If this Bill is not passed in its present form I suppose it will drop altogether. I hope your Lordships will not support the Motion of Lord Saltoun, and on behalf of the Government we shall be glad to consent to a short adjournment in the hope that an arrangement may be come to. But I press on the House that if an arrangement has not been come to when the adjourned debate is resumed the Bill should be passed in its present form.

THE EARL OF PLYMOUTH: My Lords, having an Amendment at a later stage on the Paper I should like to say that I do not wish to stand in the way of the suggestion of my noble friend Lord Balfour that the debate should be adjourned. But my information coincides with that of the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees, who informed your Lordships that various attempts had been made at a compromise with very little result. Whether after the close of this debate the conditions may have altered to a certain extent, and there may be a possibility of a compromise I do not know, but for my part I certainly should not stand in the way of the suggested adjournment in the hope that some compromise may be arrived at.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I can only speak again by the indulgence of the House. I suggested the adjournment because I thought it would be much better that there should be a renewed conference rather than that we should impose on either party a settlement on our own authority. I suggest an adjournment, say, till Monday, in the hope of arriving at a settlement which might bring peace.

Moved, "That the debate be adjourned."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

LORD SALTOUN: My Lords, I gladly agree to Lord Balfour's Motion in the hope that in the meantime some agreement may be come to.

Lord Tweedmouth.

VISCOUNT HILL: My Lords, I should like to intervene for one moment in view of what has been said by the Lord Chairman and Lord Plymouth in reference to the likelihood of a settlement being come to after this debate. From information which was given to me on entering the House, I am afraid that is entirely out of the question. The offer has been made that if Clause 4 did not come into force for ten years they might agree to a compromise, but not otherwise. Therefore, I do not think an adjournment will be of any advantage.

On Question, debate adjourned to Wednesday next.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Petition to be heard by counsel against; of Manchester Wholesale Provision Association; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Petition for alteration of; of the mayor, aldermen and councillors of the metropolitan borough of Wandsworth; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

IRELAND (EVICTED TENANTS).

Return respecting. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order of 24th July last), and to be printed. (No. 146.)

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3880. Corea.

No. 3881. China (Ichang).

No. 3882. China (Amoy).

No. 3883. Tunis.

No. 3884. Colombia (Barranquilla and Cartagena).

No. 3885. Persia (Arabistan).

No. 3886. France (Cochin-China).

No. 3887. Netherlands (Dutch Guiana).

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 663. State encouragement to Industry in Hungary.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.

Annual Report of the President for the Session 1906–1907.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Thirty-fifth Annual Report, for the year 1905–1906.

1. Supplement containing the report of the medical officer.

2. Supplement in continuation of the report of the medical officer on sanatoria for consumption and certain other aspects of the tuberculosis question.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903 (EVICTED TENANTS).

Memorandum, dated 10th May, 1906, issued by the Estates Commissioners for guidance of assistant inspectors when making inquiries with reference to applications received from persons seeking reinstatement as evicted tenants, or as the representatives of evicted tenants.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EVIDENCE (COLONIAL STATUTES) BILL.

Brought from the Commons. Read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday next: [The Lord Elgin (*E. Elgin and Kincardine*)]. (No. 147.)

VACCINATION (SCOTLAND) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, the objects of this Bill are two-fold—first of all, to introduce into Scotland the provisions of the English Vaccination Act, 1898, as regards conscientious objection; and, secondly, to incorporate the principles of the English Bill of this year which substitutes a statutory declaration for appearance before a magistrate. As regards the first of these points, I do not think there can be any doubt that the difference between the law of the two countries which at present exists constitutes a very grave anomaly; and, as an instance of how great that difference is, I would ask your Lordships to imagine the case of two neighbours on the border of Scotland and England, one living on each side of the border, both, we will say, with a recent addition to their family, and each with a conscientious objection to vaccination. What would happen if they did not wish to have the children vaccinated? The man living on the English side of the border could go before a magistrate, and if he was able to convince him that he conscientiously believed that such a course would be injurious to his child's health he could obtain relief; but the man living on the Scottish side of the border could obtain no such relief. If he did not have his child vaccinated he would be liable to prosecution, and to a fine or imprisonment, possibly for ten days. I think it would be very hard to persuade my Scottish friend that the law dealt fairly as between him and his neighbour.

I know that your Lordships do not as a rule like to be asked to legislate differently for the two countries, though it has occasionally been my duty to ask you to do so, sometimes successfully and sometimes unsuccessfully. I am glad that to-day I am not likely to be told, as I was told the other day, that I am asking the House to stultify itself, for here we have a Bill which seeks to extend to Scotland a principle which was applied to England nine years ago by noble Lords opposite when they were in office. It does not seem very much to ask that the principle should now be extended to Scotland. If it was just nine years ago in the case of England, it must be equally just to-day in the case of Scotland; and I must submit that it is an instalment of justice which is now considerably overdue. I do not wish to waste the time of the House by arguing so self-evident a proposition, and indeed it is not easy to see on what grounds it can be opposed.

I have made inquiries as to what are the grounds on which the opponents of this Bill rely, and so far I have only been able to find one. I have no doubt that the noble Lord who is to move the rejection of the Bill will supply us with others. But the only one which I have been able to find is that it is said that there has not been the same agitation in Scotland against compulsory vaccination as there had been in England when Mr. Chaplin's Bill was passed. I am sure that is not a ground which will appeal to your Lordships. I remember that not very long ago it was urged by a noble and learned Lord who sits on the other side of the House, but whom I do not see in his place at the moment, as a reason for rejecting the Qualification of Women

(County and Borough Councils) Bill that such a course would be considered to be a concession to the riotous and noisy behaviour of certain women in the neighbourhood of the Houses of Parliament and elsewhere. I am glad to say your Lordships did not endorse that view. But surely it would indeed be putting a premium on that form of political agitation if your Lordships were to say that you would not pass a Bill because its supporters had carried on their campaign in a quiet and orderly manner.

The number of those in Scotland who object to compulsory vaccination may not be so great as the number holding the same view in England, but their grievance is just as real and their claim to have it redressed just as strong. I think this grievance must have been recognised by the noble Lord opposite and his predecessor at the Scottish Office, for under their beneficent rule a system of administering the vaccination law was instituted which has been continued ever since. Under that system, when once a conviction has been obtained against a man for non-compliance with the Vaccination Act the majesty of the law is considered to have been vindicated, and he is not again prosecuted either in respect of that child or in respect of any other child whom he may refuse to have vaccinated. This relaxation, while it redeems the administration of the vaccination law from any suspicion of persecution, is at the same time, I think, a tacit admission that the law as it stands is a harsh one, and I think it constitutes a fair ground for asking that it shall be altered. Further, in spite of the almost illegal leniency with which parish councils have been allowed to administer the vaccination law in Scotland, the number of prosecutions has increased more or less steadily during the last ten years. I admit that even now the number is not very large. I will give your Lordships the figures. In 1896 there were thirty-two prosecutions, while in 1905 there were ninety-one. That figure, I admit, was an exceptionally high one, for in the preceding year the number was fifty-four, and for the year before that sixty-five, while the number last year was sixty-four; so that it may be fairly said that the prosecutions have doubled during the last ten years.

I have explained the first of the objects of this Bill. The second object is the incorporation of the principle contained in the English Bill of this year. In this case I am afraid I cannot rely upon precedent, because though that Bill has been introduced in this House and is down for Second Reading this afternoon, it has not yet been discussed by your Lordships, and I do not know what view you take of it. I do not wish to trespass on the preserves of my noble friend Lord Allendale, who I believe is to move the Second Reading of that Bill, and I do not wish to detain your Lordships upon a matter which you will shortly hear presented to you much more ably by my noble friend. But it is necessary that I should say shortly what that principle is as it is included in this Bill. Perhaps the simplest way to explain the matter would be to remind your Lordships of what has been done in England. The conscientious-objector clause of the English Act of 1898 provides that no parent or other person shall be liable to any penalty under Sections 29 or 31 of the Act of 1867 if within four months of the birth of the child he satisfies two magistrates, or a stipendiary or metropolitan police magistrate, in petty sessions, that he conscientiously believes that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of the child. The English Bill of this year provides that, instead of having to go before the magistrate and satisfy him that he has this conscientious objection, the person objecting may make a statutory declaration to that effect.

This declaration has to be made in accordance with the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835. Section 18 of that Act provides that a voluntary declaration may be made before a justice of the peace, notary public, or other officer of the law authorised to adminster an oath, so that it will no longer be necessary, if that law is passed, for a conscientious objector to go before a magistrate. But if he does elect to go before a magistrate he will go like any other member of the public who wishes to make a voluntary statutory declaration, and not as a prisoner who, in order to escape punishment, has to persuade the magistrate of what is passing in his (the prisoner's) mind—a feat which I would submit to the House is a practical impossibility unless the magistrate chooses to lend himself to the farce. That principle of statutory declaration is here embodied, so that it will be seen that what this Bill proposes to do is to take at one stride the step which was taken in England in 1898, and the one which it is proposed to take this year. I ask your Lordships to give the Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I rise, in pursuance of the notice which I have given, to move that this Bill be read a second time this day three months. The speech to which we have just listened has not disappointed me in one respect, because I fully anticipated that the noble Lord and those who advise him would put most of their case upon the supposed analogy between England and Scotland, and would argue that because you have done a certain thing under certain circumstances in England therefore you are in duty bound to do the same thing for Scotland. The noble Lord at one period of his speech went so far as to characterise that as a self-evident proposition. It will be part of my case to-day to show, not only that it is not a self-evident proposition, but that there is not the slightest iota of foundation, in fact, for the suggestion that there is the smallest vestige of analogy between the circumstances of England and the circumstances as they exist in Scotland.

The second part of my case will be that there is no demand of any sort or kind for this particular proposition so far as the circumstances of Scotland are concerned, and I shall also, with the indulgence of the House, say a few words in criticism of the action of the Government as to the time and the method which they have chosen to bring forward this extraordinary proposition. I say that there is no analogy between the circumstances of England and those of Scotland. The law is different; the administration has been different; the results have been different; and the difficulties which have to be encountered have never been the same. It is perfectly true that discontent with the administration of the English Vaccination Acts culminated in a considerable agitation after the appointment, and, indeed, I think, after the Report of the Royal Commission, and under the circumstances as they then existed the Government of which I was a member passed the Act of 1898 to which allusion has been made. But the Government and those who advised them did not pass that Act because they liked it; they passed it because circumstances as they existed rendered it not only necessary, but wise and judicious.

So great was the discontent in England against compulsory vaccination at the time that large and important local authorities were practically in revolt, and you could not procure the due administration of the law, and in some parts of the country—I remember the circumstances well—something like 60 or 65 per cent. of the children were all that were being vaccinated under the existing law. As a matter of fact you could not enforce the compulsory system, and accordingly, with the consent of both sides in Parliament, vaccination in England was made voluntary. But there never has been anything analogous to those circumstances in Scotland. I appeal in this instance to the Report of the Royal Commission, which was presided over by Lord Herschell, whose judicial capacity is acknowledged by both sides, and I venture to say that a more broad-minded individual never sat in this House, and anything to which he appended his name is entitled to the most serious consideration. The Royal Commission pointed out that the law of vaccination in Scotland was comprised in one statute and one statute only—that of 1863. That statute provided for the appointment of public vaccinators for the exercise of their function in accordance with the regulations to be issued from time to time by the Local Government Board. By Section 8 the duty was imposed upon all parents to have their children vaccinated by a regular medical practitioner within six months of the birth. As a matter of fact the English Acts provided for three months and not for six months, and a great deal of the evil that arose in England is attributed, in my opinion rightly, by the Commissioners to that difference in the law—a difference which has now been removed.

But paragraph 126 of the Report says that both the statute law and the method of administration differ widely. One difference is that a public authority can pay a private practitioner for vaccinating the children of those on whom he is in attendance. The great majority of vaccinations in Scotland are, in consequence, performed by private medical practitioners, and when the parish council issue an order to vaccinate a defaulter very many of them are now vaccinated in consequence of these notices. The Commissioners go on to say—

> "The distinct feature of the Scottish system is that the operation is carried out in almost all cases at the home of the person concerned."

As I am anxious to establish this point, not on my authority, but on the authority of the Commission, I will venture to quote verbatim two short paragraphs from the Commissioners' Report. Paragraph 518 is in these words—

> "The Scottish vaccination law and its method of procedure discriminates in a manner unknown in this country between the cases in which the failure to procure vaccination was due to hostility to the practice on the part of the parent and those which resulted from neglect and indifference."

In paragraph 524 they say—

> "The aim of the Commission and their desire is to preclude the attempt to compel those who are honestly opposed to the practice to submit their children to vaccination, and, at the same time, leave the law to operate, as at present, to prevent children remaining unvaccinated owing to the neglect or indifference of the parents."

Those are true and weighty words, but that is the real distinction which you want to establish—the real distinction which every statesman desires to establish, and which I venture to suggest is better now ascertained by the Scottish practice as it exists than by the English practice as it was before or as it has been amended.

I will very briefly explain the actual state of the law in Scotland. The ruling sections are Sections 17 and 18 of the Act of 1863. Your Lordships will remember that there is the obligation to have children vaccinated before they are six months old. Section 17 of the Act lays the obligation upon the parent or custodian of the child to transmit within a certain time a certificate to the registrar, either of vaccination or of "unsusceptibility" to vaccination, or a medical certificate asking for the postponement of the process. If that certificate is not presented to the registrar within a certain time he sends a notice to the parent—not to the public authority but to the parent—and if the parent disobeys that notice he is liable to a small monetary penalty, not for not having the child vaccinated but for not having sent the particular notice to the registrar. If after six months the child is still not vaccinated the registrar reports the matter to the parish council. The parish council communicates with the parent and sends the public vaccinator to offer to vaccinate the child, and if that offer is refused the parish council may proceed, and ought to proceed, to prosecution. That is the system in Scotland.

Your Lordships will observe that there are two stages and two distinct notices, one demanding the certificate of vaccination or a reason for the operation's not being performed, and the second, after a lapse of six months, to prosecute. The result was that up to the time I left the Scottish Office, for a series of years 97 per cent. of the children in Scotland who lived six months after their birth had been successfully vaccinated, the 3 per cent. unvaccinated including all the children lost sight of and those who were "unsusceptible" to vaccination. Through the agency of the parish councils we succeeded in vaccinating 97 per cent., and during the whole of that time the agitation was going on in England, and everything was being done that could be done to stir up opposition to the law in Scotland; yet during the whole of the eight years that I had to do with the matter not a single local authority in Scotland refused to perform its duty.

Let us just see under what amount of pressure 97 per cent. of the children were vaccinated. In 1903 there was 12,081 defaulters under the first of those sections I have indicated; in 1904 there were 12,200; in 1905, 12,660; and in 1906, 12,488. By the first of those two processes the public authorities succeeded in the first year in getting 7,300 vaccinated; in the second year, 7,350; in the third year, 6,900; and in the fourth year, 7,200; and that with an infinitesimal number of prosecutions. In 1904 there were altogether at both stages seventy-three prosecutions and sixty-eight convictions; in 1905, 104 prosecutions and eighty-three convictions; and in 1906, 109 prosecutions and 105 convictions. The noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of the Bill tried to make a point of the increasing number of prosecutions, but they are not increasing much more than in the ratio of the population; and surely if these really remarkable results are obtained by prosecuting on an average rather less than 100 people a year, it is not worth while making any change in the law.

The agitation, such as it is, against the law is concentrated in one or two places, and over the whole of Scotland I have never seen the slightest sign of discontent. The law has the support of the public, it is administered by local authorities which are popularly elected, and, so far as I can ascertain, the whole thing is working with perfect smoothness. I agree entirely with the statement in the Report of the Commission. The object which any one ought to have in view in this matter is, as the Commissioners say, to distinguish between honest opposition and mere carelessness and neglect. I desire to speak with respect and courtesy of those who do not believe in vaccination, though I am bound to say I do not think much of their intelligence or their power of weighing evidence. But that is not the question. There are a certain minority of people who are honestly opposed to the process. They say that vaccination is an interference with freedom, but so is almost every operation of government. It is an interference with the freedom of the Quaker to make him compulsorily subscribe to the payment of the military forces of the Crown, but we do not take note of his conscientions objection in the matter.

The very people who are most loud in condemnation of this interference with the freedom of the subject in the matter of vaccination are often those who are anxious to interfere with the freedom of adult people to get a glass of beer or a glass of something else if they want it. Therefore, to say that this is an untoward or wrong interference with the liberty of the subject is not an argument which will bear investigation. I venture to suggest that the true doctrine is, that in a matter of this kind it is important that the community should have the power to protect itself against one of the most malignant and loathsome diseases to which our poor flesh may fall a victim, and I say that if by the provisions of this Bill you weaken the security of the community or the possibility of its protecting itself you will do one of the worst things this House has ever been asked to do. I am willing to give every consideration to the conscientious objector, but I want to make sure that he is a conscientious objector, and not neglectful or a humbug.

The noble Lord was not correct in saying that I was responsible for the present system. I continued what was originated under the guidance of Sir George Trevelyan and Lord Lothian. It is perfectly true however, that for a long period of years it has been the consistent practice of the Local Government Board for Scotland to put every pressure they could on local authorities not to undertake second prosecutions, not to press for imprisonment in default of payment of fine, and so on. I venture to say that, after all, the best test of real sincerity is to take a man quietly and gently to the police court and fine him 2s. 6d., 5s. or 10s. as the case may be. I will not say it myself, but I am sure that some Englishmen who follow me in the debate will say that perhaps that monetary test is more likely to appeal to the Scottish conscience than anything else. I will accept the gibe in perfect good humour, and if the Scottish nature is such that it is more amenable to a fine of 2s. 6d. then I say let us take advantage of that and continue the good work which has been carried on.

It is nonsense to speak, as some agitators do speak, about a man being treated as a common criminal if he is summoned before a police magistrate. Any of us are liable to be summoned to a police court and ordered to pay a fine of 2s. 6d. or a similar sum for allowing a chimney to be on fire. I do not see that there is a vestige of moral disgrace in being taken to a police court and fined 2s. 6d. on an occasion of this kind, but I do say it is wrong to imprison a man for conscience sake. During the eight years of my administration of the Scottish Office there was not a single case of imprisonment for a breach of the vaccination laws; at any rate, I can honestly say that none was brought to my notice. I am afraid, however, that it is true that there recently has been one. A newspaper extract was sent to me a day or two ago recording the fact that a man in a humble rank of life had been sentenced to ten days imprisonment for not having his child vaccinated. I know nothing more than the bare fact; but I say that for myself I cannot imagine a more regrettable circumstance. I cannot imagine anything which is more likely to stimulate agitation against the administration of the vaccination laws, and I believe there must have been some special circumstances, the whole facts of which we do not know.

I cannot conceal from myself that the real object of many of those who are getting up this agitation arises not so much from the fact that they themselves are conscientious objectors as that they desire to see vaccination abolished altogether. That fact was strikingly brought out in a speech which was made by one of a deputation which I received in April, 1903, on this subject of vaccination. The leading speaker at that deputation was the hon. secretary of the Anti-Vaccination League, and some kind friend had sent me beforehand some extracts from a speech which he had made on the subject. I found that the hon. secretary of this League had said—

> "Perhaps I should not conclude without a parting remark with reference to the special grievance under which we labour in Scotland—the want of the conscience clause. Such a clause is a very fine thing to cry; the want of it is a glaring injustice, and we are justified in bitterly complaining on account of our treatment by Parliament. But, speaking for myself, I think the conscience clause is an insult."

He went on to say—

> "All the same we want a conscience clause for Scotland: but, more than that, we want the repeal of the Vaccination Acts for the whole of England, Scotland, and Ireland."

Here you have the truth. You are asked for what they call an insult, but it is admitted that they want the repeal of the Vaccination Acts.

I pass to the third point I wish to press on the House. I have endeavoured to prove that there is no analogy between the circumstances of England and of Scotland. There is no agitation in Scotland against the Vaccination Acts. They are being administered with perfect success and with the practical consent of the whole population. There is no demand either on the part of the public or the parish councils for this proposal, and there has been, so far as I know, no public debate on the subject. I have not seen a single resolution passed by a public body in Scotland asking for this measure, and I do not believe the noble Lord and his advisers can produce a jot of expert opinion, either legal, official, or medical, in favour of this proposal. I have no right to ask what are the opinions of the officials of the Local Government Board, but I know what their views were when I was at the Scottish Office; and I venture to say that the noble Lord and his advisers are not dealing fairly with the House if they keep back from us what I am confident is the fact, that the skilled administrators of the law, the medical experts of the Local Government Board, are practically unanimous against this proposal.

But I do not think that either this House or the public in Scotland are being quite fairly treated in this matter. Why has this Bill been delayed till the 1st of August? During the debate on the Address the question of the administration of the English Acts was raised, and in that discussion one or two Scottish Members took part. One Member spoke against the administration of the Act and demanded a conscience clause for Scotland, while another — a supporter of His Majesty's Government—spoke on the other side, and the Secretary for Scotland before the conclusion of the debate promised to consider the matter. He has been considering it from February until the end of July. I venture to say that if there is any pressing demand for this alteration in the law it ought to have been tabled in such a form that Scotland could have expressed its opinion at an earlier period of the session. The procedure of the Government has been such as to prevent our even testing the question as to whether there is any demand, and if we to-night reject the Bill, with the certainty that it will be brought up again, we shall be doing a wiser thing than if we pass it. The principle of vaccination is to protect every one, and to make vaccination optional would strike at the very foundation of the safeguard. If your Lordships believe in vaccination and that it has proved a safeguard to the people of Scotland, as I certainly do, then it is your duty to reject this Bill. I repeat that the Government have not treated your Lordships nor the people of Scotland fairly in bringing forward this measure, which has not yet been to the other House, in August, and at a time when the people of Scotland, whom your Lordships might wish to consult upon it, are away on their holidays. I beg to move.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and to add at the end of the Motion the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, my withers are certainly unwrung by having to speak a word or two on this Bill, and they will not be many; for I must confess to agreeing very much with the view of the noble Lord who has just sat down as to the folly of people who neglect the vaccination of their children. But the speech that my noble friend has just delivered was not a speech in opposition to this particular little Bill, but really a speech in favour of the repeal of the Act of 1898 passed by the Government of which the noble Lord was himself a member. The noble Lord says there is no analogy between England and Scotland. It is perfectly true that the inhabitants of Scotland have objected much less than those of England to compulsory vaccination; but it seems to me to be a hard thing that a man holding that view and able to obtain exemption in England should not be able to do so if he happens to reside in Scotland.

My noble friend says that there has been no demand for this legislation. That is not the information that comes to the Scottish Office. There have been considerable representations that men—a small number, I admit—do feel the present state of affairs in Scotland to be an injustice. My noble friend himself laid down what was the proper course to take in regard to these people in the year 1903, in the answer he gave to a deputation from the Anti-Vaccination League. Speaking on that occasion my noble friend said—

"He regarded the enforcement of a penalty in such a way as was done in Scotland as a perfectly fair, and, as he thought, the best, test of the sincerity of the conscientious objector. He would not be in favour of long sentences or of forcing people who had stood the test to a further prosecution."

Is not that a curious alternative? Here you are to have the power of punishing, even by imprisonment, a man who objects to have his child vaccinated, and yet when he repeats the offence the noble Lord himself says it would be a monstrous thing to press him further. Is not that a ridiculous state of things to which to subject people with conscientious objections? This is, after all, a small matter. I do not think the Bill will be greatly made use of in Scotland; but if there are a few people in that country who have conscientious objections they ought to have the same advantages as are enjoyed by the inhabitants of England.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I only desire to trouble your Lordships with one or two remarks with regard to this Bill. My noble friend did not give any answer to Lord Balfour as to why this Bill has been introduced so late as the 1st of August. Complaint has been made very frequently in your Lordships' House of the treatment of this House with reference to the introduction of Bills, and I think this is the most flagrant case I ever remember. This Bill might perfectly well have been introduced in the month of March. Has the Secretary for Scotland considered the matter? The noble Lord indicates that he has. At what period did he arrive at his final decision? At all events, he has arrived at that decision at a moment when it is impossible to obtain the opinions of those in Scotland upon it. If the measure had been introduced in March, or April, or May, at a time when it could have been submitted to the local authorities, then we should have known what Scottish opinion was; but at this moment it is impossible to arrive at what public opinion is on this matter.

The noble Lord who introduced the Bill did not say on what the Bill was founded, but the First Lord of the Admiralty told us that the Secretary for Scotland had had representations made to him. Can we be told what those representations were, or whom they were made by, because at present we have no authority whatever to show on whose advice the Bill is based? Will the Government go so far as to say that it is based on the advice of the Local Government Board? It certainly is not based on the advice of the parish councils or the district councils. That is absolutely certain; and so far as the public Press of Scotland is concerned, I have never seen any notice whatever taken of this particular subject. There is less excuse for the introduction of this Bill at this late period than any Bill I remember. No one can say that this is a political question and that that was the reason why it was not dealt with earlier. It is a question of administration such as your Lordships are particularly able to express an opinion about, and such as certainly ought to be submitted to public opinion in Scotland.

With regard to the merits of the Bill, if there really are a large number of people who wish their children to be candidates for small-pox I do not know why this House should particularly object, provided always that they do not place other people in danger. But at the present time we have no proof at all that there is any public desire for this Bill in Scotland. I do not know whether the noble Lord intends to push his Amendment as far as absolutely dividing the House, but certainly at the present time it seems to me that the Bill is entirely uncalled for, and I should like to ask on whose advice it is founded.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): My Lords, I will not trespass on your Lordships' attention for more than two or three minutes. I have always thought that Scotland was the Cinderella of the United Kingdom, for we never get more than a second or third place in legislation, and I am afraid that in crowded sessions the second or third place leaves very little opportunity for anything being effected. The objection that this Bill is brought in late might be effective if your Lordships had not plenty of leisure to-day for the purpose of deciding it. If your Lordships were unable to get through your work it would be a very different thing. There have been many expressions of dissatisfaction, very naturally, that work has not been brought to this House. Now here is a Bill introduced in this House, and it is objected to because it is brought in late.

I am not one of those who presume to decide where doctors differ, and I have always submitted to the vaccination laws on the ground of authority; but what I understood the noble Lord to desire were two things—first, that there should be as much vaccination in Scotland as possible; and, secondly, that we should pay the greatest respect to the opinion of Lord Herschell and the Royal Commission. On the first point, I believe the Act of 1898 to have been successful in producing more vaccination in England. Therefore the same thing would not produce harm, but good, in Scotland. The noble Lord cannot have considered the recommendation of the Royal Commission, because they support the application of this provision to Scotland as well as to England. In Paragraph 524 the Commissioners say—

> "After careful consideration and much study of the subject, we have arrived at the conclusion that it would conduce to increase vaccination if a scheme could be devised which would preclude the attempt (so often a vain one) to compel those who are honestly opposed to the practice to submit their children to vaccination, and, at the same time, leave the law to operate, as at present, to prevent children remaining unvaccinated owing to the neglect or indifference of the parents."

When vaccination was made optional there was more vaccination. The Royal Commissioners in the next paragraph say—

> "We may give the following as examples of the methods which might be adopted. It might be provided that if a parent attended before the local authority and satisfied them that he entertained such an objection no proceedings should be taken against him;—

that is the law in England;

> "Or, again, a statutory declaration to that effect before anyone now authorised to take such declaration, or some other specified official or officials, might be made a bar to proceedings."

That is exactly the proposal in this Bill. The next paragraph proceeds—

> "It is in England that the point we have been recently discussing is of most practical importance, but if our suggestion were adopted the change should, of course, be made in all parts of the United Kingdom."

After all, this is a proposal based on the recommendations of the Royal Commission and brought forward by the Government on the evidence that they have that dissatisfaction exists in Scotland, and in the belief that the Bill will lead to an increase of vaccination.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I beg the noble and learned Lord's pardon, but you cannot increase much beyond 97 per cent.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: You might get it almost universal. If the people of Scotland are led to believe that they are to be treated differently from the people of England, there will arise an unreasonable, irrational, and obstinate feeling against vaccination which does not now exist. I sincerely hope your Lordships will not inflict an injustice upon Scotland by rejecting the Bill.

*VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: My Lords, I think the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has hardly done justice to the objection which has been raised by Lord Balfour and Lord Camperdown on the question of procedure. The objection, as I understood it, was not that your Lordships had not sufficient time to discuss this Bill. We have plenty of time. I wish we could expect as much time to discuss other Bills that will come up to us later. The objection was this, that a change, which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack and the First Lord of the Admiralty have stated is a change of importance in the vaccination law of Scotland, has been brought forward at an extremely late period of the session and that no time has been given to the people of Scotland to consider the Bill and express their opinion upon it. That is the grievance of which we complain, and it is a grievance which, if I may venture to say so, was not at all met by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. I suppose we shall not get any explanation of the reason which has induced this delay.

I now come to the merits of the Bill. I should be the last to suggest that it was a self-evident proposition, as I think the noble Lord who introduced the Bill suggested, that Scottish and English law should be identical on any conceivable subject. I believe that would be a proposition which would command almost universal dissent on both sides of the border. If vaccination was now really compulsory in Scotland, or if my noble friend Lord Balfour had suggested that he desired to make it so, then I think the objection to this Bill on the ground of procedure would be far stronger than it is under present circumstances. What are those circumstances? We have in England a procedure, recommended by the Royal Commission, under which in the great majority of petty sessions an applicant for a certificate of exemption merely has to declare his conscientious objection to the vaccinaton of his child, and practically without any further trouble he is granted a certificate. It is proposed that instead of that procedure in future there shall be a mere statutory declaration to that effect made before a magistrate or any person qualified to receive it, and, so far as I know, that proposed alteration in the law has not been met with any serious objection on the part of English representatives in another place. The English Bill is on your Lordships' Paper to-night, and I see no notice of any objection to it.

It is proposed to introduce a similar system into Scotland. My noble friend Lord Balfour admits that the present system in Scotland is something akin to a farce. Surely it is a farce to summon a man for one offence, to fine him, and possibly even imprison him for that offence, and then to let him go scot free in respect of all the rest of his children, as well as that particular child. My noble friend says that the result is that 97 per cent. of the children in Scotland are vaccinated. The reason that this large percentage of children are vaccinated is that there is a great and almost universal opinion in Scotland in favour of vaccination, and the change in the law that is now proposed will not do away with that opinion in the least. It will remain, and, as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has suggested, it may be strengthened by this change. I believe it is clear that the change in the law in England, where there was great objection to compulsory vaccination, has had the effect of increasing vaccination.

My noble friend who has moved the rejection of this Bill has not stated that he is in favour of compulsory vaccination. On the contrary, he would object to repeated fines, and in all cases to imprisonment. He objects as strongly to imprisonment as any of your Lordships, and he regrets that there have been instances in Scotland where imprisonment has taken place. Further than that, my noble friend said a fine of 2s. 6d. or 10s. is a very small matter, and that Scotsmen, in spite of their traditional objection to the payment of money, do not very much object to it. I think we should consider these fines, small though they appear to us, in the light in which they may appear to the poorest of the community. Even a fine of 2s. 6d. may be felt to be a hardship by some person who knows that if he were in the same position in England he would be entitled to exemption. I am bound to say, differing as I do with the greatest regret from my noble friend, whose experience and knowledge of Scottish matters are infinitely greater than mine, and whose administration of Scottish affairs when he was entrusted with them was approved and praised by all, that having to vote on this Bill with regard to what are the merits of the case, I feel it impossible to go into the lobby with him against the Second Reading.

On Question, whether "now" shall stand part of the Motion, resolved in the affirmative; Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Wednesday next.

LEEDS (SOUTH PARADE CHAPEL) CHARITY BILL.

Moved, "That the House resolve itself into Committee."—(*Lord Weardale.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, before the House is put into Committee on this Bill I think it is right I should say one word, if only to express my obligation to the noble Lord opposite for having postponed this Order until to-night. I may just add one or two observations. The noble Lord when he brought this Bill to your Lordships' notice did not say why it was that he proceeded by way of public Bill rather than in the ordinary method of a scheme made by the Charity Commissioners and laid before this House to lie on the Table a certain number of days. But the reason appears the moment you read the Report of the Charity Commission. The reason is that this Bill—I refer especially to the Kingswood Bill—proposes to make an alteration, not merely in the ordinary conditions under which the charity is administered, but actually in the code of doctrine which is allowed to be taught in connection with the endowment. I think it right to call attention to this very interesting fact, that this religious denomination has come to Parliament in order to obtain the right to change the connection of a particular endowment with a particular code of doctrine. In other words, Parliament is being asked to sanction a change in the doctrinal foundation of the trust deed on which this charity is administered. That is an important circumstance, and will form a very valuable precedent, as I venture to think, for future and larger questions which may be brought before your Lordships' House. It is interesting to find, when taunts are levelled against the Established Church in matters affecting her endowments, that being established does not really affect the point, but that in this respect a Free Church is in principle no freer than is an Established Church. One and all, if they require to modify any conditions attaching to their endowments, must come before Parliament in order to effect it. That is the first and most important moral to be drawn from these Bills; but there is a second equally important, and it is this, that when a religious denomination belonging to one of the Free Churches does come to Parliament with this request, the demand is not met by obstruction, nor by question, nor by any attempt to limit the right of the denomination to approach Parliament in the matter; on the contrary, although the change in the matter of doctrine which is proposed is different not only in degree but in kind from any such question that has ever been mooted in the Established Church in my lifetime, yet no question is made as to their right to approach Parliament regarding it and to have so essential a particular in the trust deed modified. I believe your Lordships will accept without division the plea of this religious denomination to have its trust deed profoundly modified in its doctrinal adjunct merely because the denomination wish it. This is a very valuable precedent which I desire to place on record before the Bill passes.

LORD WEARDALE: My Lords, the noble Lord has very correctly interpreted the view of the Charity Commissioners, that these matters can only be dealt with by Act of Parliament, and it is because they can only be so dealt with that these Bills have been introduced. But I think there is a distinction to be drawn between the action in this matter and actions that might be taken in regard to the Established Church. Upon that subject, however, I do not wish to enlarge this evening. I therefore merely move that the House now go into Committee.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House in Committee;

Bill reported without Amendment Standing Committee negatived; Bill to be read 3ª on Monday next.

KINGSWOOD (WHITFIELD TABERNACLE SCHOOLROOM, ETC.) CHARITY BILL.

LONGTON (CAROLINE STREET CHAPEL) CHARITY BILL.

House in Committee (according to order); Bills reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, this is a short Bill of twelve clauses, and I think it will commend itself to the House as it is designed to put a stop to fraud in the butter trade and to impose further regulations on the trade in margarine and other articles. In certain butter factories animal fat and oils are worked up in the manufacture of butter, and as there is no authority under the present law to inspect these factories we have no check on this adulteration. Under the first clause of the Bill power is taken to register factories and consignments, and by the second clause the factories are made open to inspection by the local authority as well as the Board of Agriculture.

New regulations will also be applied to the article known as "milk-blended butter." This butter is not to be sold or described by any name which is connected with the dairy interest. By Section 8 of the Bill it is provided that milk-blended butter shall be dealt with under such name or names as may be approved by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and under the conditions applicable to the sale or description of margarine, with the substitution of an approved name for the word "margarine,' and with this modification, that in any case where, in order to comply with those conditions, the article is delivered to the purchaser in a wrapper, there shall, in addition to the approved name, be printed on the wrapper in such manner as the Board approves such description of the article setting out the percentage of moisture or water contained therein as may be approved by the Board.

The penalties for offences are heavy. Any person guilty of an offence under the Bill is made liable on conviction under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts for a first offence to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds, for a second offence to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds, and for a third or any subsequent offence to a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds; and, in cases where imprisonment can be inflicted under section seventeen of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899, to such imprisonment as is by that section authorised. Margarine must be sold in wrappers with the word "Margarine" printed in plain letters upon it, and no fancy name suggesting dairy produce must be used. Provision is made in Clause 4 as to the limit of moisture in butter, margarine, and milk-blended butter, and by Clause 5 we propose to prohibit the importation of these articles. The Bill has been very carefully drawn and follows the recommendations of Sir Edward Strachey's Committee, which took considerable interest in this subject. The Bill is desired by a great portion of the population, and as there is very little that is contentious in it I hope your Lordships will be good enough to give it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, the Butter Bill is a very old friend. It has been introduced in several sessions of Parliament. I myself was sponsor for it in 1905, and at that time it was somewhat strenuously opposed by some of the friends of the noble Earl in another place. The noble Earl is more fortunate than I was in having converted them to a better view of the matter. The Bill now before your Lordships differs in a material degree from that which I had the honour of submitting to Parliament, for our Bill proposed that what is called milk-blended butter should not be allowed to be sold at all. In this Bill the noble Earl proposes that it should continue to be sold, but under another name. It is said that milk-blended butter is a wholesome and nourishing article. No doubt it is. The water on the Table of your Lordships' House is a wholesome if not nourishing drink. But if you buy 16 ozs. of milk-blended butter on a Saturday night and keep it until Monday morning and find that during that time a portion of it has evaporated and that you have only 15 ozs. left, I think you will agree that it is a very bad bargain. The Committee have said that this is not in reality a cheap food, having regard to the amount of water contained in it. I venture to say that it is not a satisfactory condition of affairs that His Majesty's Government should propose to sanction what is undoubtedly a fraud upon the purchaser. However, I am not going to oppose the Second Reading of the Bill, because I believe that even the Bill as it is is better than no Bill at all. But I would ask, what is the Board of Agriculture going to call this stuff?

I heard the other day a story in connection with a Committee of the House of Commons. The Committee did not know how to pronounce "margarine." They sent for one of the waiters in the refreshment department and asked, "Do you call this 'margarine' or 'marjarine'?" and the waiter replied, "We call it butter." I venture to think that, whatever name the Board of Agriculture give it, it will be called butter. I think it would have been much better if the sale of this article had been prohibited altogether. I recognise that since the time my Bill was introduced this milk-blended butter industry has assumed great proportions The profits are enormous, and friends of the noble Lord in the other House have not been able to stand up against the increased influence which those who sell this article have been able to bring to bear upon them. The Board of Agriculture should take the very greatest care in the choice of the name under which this stuff is to be sold in the future, and not allow each firm to have a different name. I would suggest that there should be one generic term for it, and then, perhaps, people may know that it is not the genuine article.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I hope that in dealing with this matter the Board of Agriculture will bear in mind that in trying to give a name or to impose a restriction in order to protect the genuine article a great deal of mischief may be inadvertently done. I have lately been reading some very interesting literature issued by the Tariff Reform Commission, and in one report there is a section dealing with agriculture, and it is pointed out that when the Margarine Bill was passing through Parliament a limitation was inserted, in the interests of British agriculturists and to prevent this product bearing too close a resemblance to butter, that it must not contain more than a certain percentage of butter material. If your Lordships will take the trouble to read the report of the Tariff Reform Commission you will find bitter lamentations by agriculturists that in consequence of that limitation they were beaten out of the market by the Dutch, who circulated this clause as a warning to purchasers not to deal with the English as the English were bound to produce a vile article. I hope that in the selection of a name or the fixing of the percentage of water, whatever it is, it will be remembered that you may very easily make a provision which you may think for your advantage but which may turn out for your disadvantage.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

VACCINATION BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD ALLENDALE: My Lords, this is a short, and, I venture to think, a very simple Bill, and after the discussion we have had on the Vaccination (Scotland) Bill I do not think I need detain your Lordships long in moving the Second Reading. The objection which was raised to the Bill introduced for Scotland is not applicable to this Bill, for this Bill has passed through the House of Commons. It met with a very favourable reception there, and though there was a division on the Second Reading the Motion was carried by 122 to 14. The Bill does not in any way alter the law of vaccination as it stands, but simply effects an alteration in the legal method of obtaining an exemption from penalties for neglecting to have a child vaccinated. At present a parent has to satisfy—and this word seems to have been capable of a very wide interpretation—two justices or a stipendiary or Metropolitan police magistrate, in petty sessions, that he conscientiously believes that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of the child, and then within seven days deliver to the vaccination officer a certificate of his conscientious objection. The Act of 1898 was passed by the last Conservative Government, who were evidently convinced that the conscientious objector had a grievance and that this was a case for legislation. The present Government take the law as they find it, and our object in this Bill is to endeavour to make it work more smoothly than it has done hitherto, complaints having been frequently made of the difficulties which conscientious objectors experience in obtaining exemptions under the existing law. It is said that in some cases applicants for these certificates have been treated by magistrates with contempt and insult, and in many cases exemption certificates have been refused altogether. In other cases the magistrates have refused to grant a certificate of exemption to the mother of the child if the father was alive and capable of making the application. Attention has been drawn to the want of uniformity in administering the Act on several occasions by the Home Office, especially by two separate Secretaries of State in memoranda—1904 to 1906—circulated on the subject referring to some remarks of the Lord Chief Justice at Birmingham in 1904. (I need not trouble your Lordships by reading them in full.) It is owing to the want of uniformity in administering the Act that this Bill has been brought in. The necessity of appearing at the police court has also been strongly objected to by persons desirous of obtaining these certificates, many of whom declare that they have been treated as *quasi* criminals. It is provided in this Bill that no parent or custodian of a child shall be liable to any penalty for the non-vaccination of the child if within four months of the child's birth he makes a statutory declaration that he conscientiously objects to vaccination and delivers it to the vaccination officer of the district. The form of declaration, which appears in the Schedule, is as follows—

> "I, *A.B.*, of in the parish of in the county of being the parent [*or* person having the custody] of a child named *C.D.*, who was born on the day of 19 , do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare that I conscientiously believe that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of the child, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations Act, 1835.
>
> Dated this day of 19 .
>
> Signed, *A.B.*
>
> Declared before me, at on the day of
>
> *E.F.* A Commissioner for Oaths (or Justice of the Peace, *or* other officer authorised to receive a statutory declaration.)

It will therefore be seen that the means of obtaining a declaration in the future will be greatly simplified. The declaration when made will be exempt from stamp duty, and the only expense to which the conscientous objector will be put will be the payment of 1s. 6d. if the declaration is made before a commissioner of oaths or a sum varying from 1s. to 2s. if made before a magistrate or justice. One objection that may be urged to this Bill is that it may make the way of the conscientious objector too easy. That argument was used against the Act of 1898, but so far that has not proved to be the case. I find from the official figures that the percentage of exemptions to the number of births has not varied but remained practically about the same, and I do not believe that the number of exemptions will be increased by making it possible for them to be obtained in a more convenient manner. I am not going to attempt to defend the Act of 1898 on any grounds of logic, but the objects sought to be obtained by this Bill are (1) to enable the conscientious objector (who is already recognised by that Act) to obtain an exemption certificate without friction and unnecessary trouble and (2) to do this in such a way as to exclude persons who have no such objection, but who merely wish to avoid the trouble of having their children vaccinated. No serious opposition has been offered to the measure in the House of Commons, and I confidently appeal to your Lordships to give it a Second Reading.

On Question, Bill read 2a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Wednesday next.

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3a on Monday next.

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL (H.L.).

House in Committee (according to order); Bill reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3a on Tuesday next.

COMPANIES (DEBENTURES AND DEBENTURE STOCK) BILL (H.L.).

Read 3a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eight o'clock, till to-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

Lord Allendale.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 1st August, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [Lords]; Selsey Water Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to :—Telegraph (Money) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to :—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]; North British Railway Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Galston for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dumbartonshire, against; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petition from Bermondsey and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1905–6, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Supplement to the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1905–6, in continuation of the Report of the Medical Officer. On Sanatoria for Consumption and certain other aspects of the Tuberculosis Question (by Command); to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3884 to 3887 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, CORK.

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1906–7, with Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Memorandum, dated 10th May, 1906, issued by the Estates Commissioners for guidance of Assistant Inspectors when making inquiries with reference to applications received from persons seeking reinstatement as Evicted Tenants or as the representatives of Evicted Tenants [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Devon), further Return relative thereto [ordered 26th July, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed [No. 283.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Imports and Exports from United Kingdom to France, United States, Belgium, and Germany.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the value of the exports to France from the United Kingdom of food, drink, tobacco, raw materials, and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what was the value of the consignments from France to the United Kingdom of food, drink, tobacco, raw materials and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the value of the exports to the United States of America from the United Kingdom of food, drink, tobacco, raw materials, and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what was the value of the consignments from the United States of America to the United Kingdom, of food, drink, tobacco, raw materials, and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what was the value of the consignments from Belgium to the United Kingdom of food, drink, tobacco, raw materials, and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the value of the exports to Belgium from the United Kingdom of food, drink, tobacco, raw materials, and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The sub-joined statements give the information asked for by the hon. Member.

I have added to these statements, for convenience of reference, the corresponding information previously supplied to him in regard to Germany.

(1) France.

	Imports into the United Kingdom consigned from France.		Exports of the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom to France.	
	1904.	1905.	1904.	1905.
	£	£	£	£
Food, drink, and tobacco .	12,878,000	12,623,000	469,000	612,000
Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured .	4,869,000	4,990,000	4,121,000	4,058,000
Articles wholly or mainly manufactured . .	26,609,000	28,370,000	9,878,000	10,713,000
Miscellaneous and unclassified (including parcels post) .	442,000	475,000	726,000	663,000
Total . .	44,798,000	46,458,000	15,194,000	16,046,000

(2) Belgium.

	Imports into the United Kingdom consigned from Belgium.		Exports of the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom to Belgium.	
	1904.	1905.	1904.	1905.
	£	£	£	£
Food, drink, and tobacco .	3,007,000	2,183,000	527,000	543,000
Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured .	2,789,000	2,957,000	1,037,000	1,147,000
Articles wholly or mainly manufactured . .	10,862,000	11,414,000	5,949,000	6,545,000
Miscellaneous and unclassified (including parcels post) .	82,000	115,000	346,000	360,000
Total . .	16,740,000	16,669,000	7,859,000	8,595,000

(3) United States.

	Imports into the United Kingdom consigned from the United States.		Exports of the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom to the United States.	
	1904.	1905.	1904.	1905.
	£	£	£	£
Food, drink, and tobacco .	45,033,000	46,289,000	1,474,000	1,560,000
Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured .	51,432,000	49,960,000	3,114,000	3,676,000
Articles wholly or mainly manufactured . .	19,624,000	18,123,000	15,272,000	11,386,000
Miscellaneous and unclassified (including parcels post)	287,000	298,000	338,000	294,000
Total -	116,376,000	114,670,000	20,198,000	23,916,000

(4) Germany.

	Imports into the United Kingdom consigned from Germany.		Exports of the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom to Germany.	
	1904.	1905.	1904.	1905.
	£	£	£	£
Food, drink, and tobacco .	11,030,000	11,230,000	2,080,000	2,946,000
Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured	3,547,000	3,896,000	3,893,000	4,458,000
Articles wholly or mainly manufactured . .	34,318,000	38,057,000	18,585,000	21,635,000
Miscellaneous and unclassified (including parcels post)	617,000	656,000	543,000	663,000
Total -	49,512,000	53,839,000	25,101,000	29,702,000

The Edalji Case.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether further inquiry of the matters connected with the Edalji case has been undertaken or is contemplated.

(Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.) I have referred to the Director of Public

Prosecutions certain statements and materials which have been submitted to me by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and the matter is now under the consideration of the Attorney-General.

French Naval Stations in the Mediterranean.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, how many separate French Mediterranean stations for torpedo craft there are in the South of France, Corsica, and on the North African coast; and what is the number of destroyers, torpedo boats, and submarines belonging to France in the Mediterranean.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The information desired is as follows:

	Destroyers.	Torpedo boats.
1st Mediterranean flotilla (Toulon)	4	55
2nd Mediterranean flotilla (Ajaccio)	1	18
3rd Mediterranean flotilla (Bizerta)	2	19
4th Mediterranean flotilla (Algiers) -	1	11
5th Mediterranean flotilla (Oran) -	1	18

	Number.
1st flotilla of submarines (Toulon)	11
2nd flotilla of submarines (Bizerta)	4

In addition to the five ports mentioned above there are sixteen stations in connection with the Defence Mobile of the Mediterranean. The above numbers are from the voted French Naval Estimates for 1907, pages 216 and 217.

Purchase of Lord Clanmorris's Estate, County Galway.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the Estates Commissioners have purchased the estate of Lord Clanmorris, Ardrahan, county Galway; if so, can he state when the land will be available for distribution; and whether full regard will be paid to the needs of the small occupying tenants in the neighbourhood, as well as the claims of young men in the district who have made application for holdings, before the lands are divided.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners assume that this Question refers to that part of Lord Clanmorris's estate which is known as the Cregclare estate. The Commissioners have now made an offer for the purchase of that property, and if the offer should be accepted, the Commissioners will distribute the untenanted land as soon as possible, but the preparations of a scheme for that purpose will necessarily take a considerable time. All applications for parcels of the land will receive full consideration.

Sir Henry Primrose as Director of the Pacific Cable Company.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Prime Minister what emoluments Sir Henry Primrose, Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, will receive as chairman of the Pacific Cable Company; and whether it is contrary to the rules of the Civil Service that a Civil Servant on the active list should hold a directorship of a public company.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) Sir Henry Primrose will receive no emoluments as chairman of the Pacific Cable Board so long as he holds a salaried office in the Civil Service; but he will retire from the chairmanship of the Board of Inland Revenue in the course of this autumn. There is, of course, no analogy between the position of a public official appointed to represent His Majesty's Government upon the Pacific Cable Board and to be chairman of that Board and that of a Civil Servant holding the position of director of a public company. The Pacific Cable Act moreover contemplates that the chairman of the Board might be the holder of some other office of profit under the Crown.

Suggested Grants to St. Helena Flax Planters.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will consider the advisability of making a special grant for the upkeep of the roads in St. Helena; and whether he will consider the advisability of extending the grant to others besides the smaller growers of flax in view of the heavy expenses involved in the initiation of the new industry, such as fencing in land and the purchase of transport animals, besides the loss in the disposal of cattle at great sacrifice by the cattle owners who were induced to invest in stock at the request of the Imperial authorities a few years ago.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) As regards the question of a special grant for the upkeep of the roads in St. Helena, I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given to the Question on the subject asked by the hon. Member for Gravesend on the 23rd July. A sum of £500 has been provided to enable the Colonial Government to assist the poorer class to grow flax. It is believed that this sum will not be more than sufficient for the purpose of assisting those who are unable to engage in the industry without aid from the Government, and the Secretary of State cannot undertake that any portion of it shall be utilised for the benefit of the larger stock owners. I may add that it is not, so far as my official information goes, correct to say that the cattle owners were induced to invest in stock at the request of the Imperial authorities a few years ago. As a matter of fact the census of 1891 shows that there were 1,139 head of cattle in the island in that year, while the estimated number of head in 1906 did not exceed 1,500.

Treasury Allowance to Luncheon Room of the Audit Branch.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that £300 profit is now in the hands of the managers of the luncheon room in the Audit Office, he will in future stop the special Treasury allowance of £76 a year towards the upkeep of this luncheon room.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The amount of the allowance is determined by the Treasury with reference to the requirements.

Pay, Leave, and Allowances of Examiners of Audit Department and Royal Ordnance Factories.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Exchequer and Audit Department, the Royal Ordnance Factories of the War Office, and the Army Accounts Department are now recruited from the same examination; and, if so, will he explain why the rates of leave and annual allowances permitted to examiners and chief examiners in the Exchequer and Audit Department do not correspond with the rates of leave and annual allowances permitted to corresponding ranks in the War Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Conditions may differ in various departments, and I am not prepared to interfere with the discretion of heads of Departments in such matters.

Prohibition of Officials of Audit Department to Lunch outside Building.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that in every Government Department where exceptional circumstances do not operate, the members are allowed to lunch outside the buildings, he will explain what exceptional circumstances compel the Comptroller and Auditor-General to prohibit his staff from lunching outside the Audit Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) No, Sir. I have already informed the hon. Member that such matters are within the discretion of heads of Departments.

Colonial Contributions to Audit Branch.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the estimated amount to be paid by the Crown Colonies and Protectorates for the year 1907–8 towards the housing accommodation, fire, light, and stationery of the Colonial Audit Branch in London, and the total received in this respect from 1889 to 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Answer to both parts of the Question is *nil*.

Postal Facilities at Bar of Slattenagh, County Leitrim.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is yet in a position to state the result of his inquiries as to the giving of increased postal facilities in the village of Bar of Slattenagh, county Leitrim.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There has been some exceptional difficulty in dealing with the matter, and my inquiries are not yet completed. I will communicate the result to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

Trust Funds of Great Crosby Halsall Girls' School.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): To ask the President of the Board of Education when the scheme for dealing with the trust funds of the Great Crosby Halsall girls' school will be ready; and whether clauses will be inserted to utilise the trust funds for the extension of the buildings of the schools for girls and infants.

(*Answered by Mr. M'Kenna.*) I have nothing to add to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member on the 13th June.

Prosecution of Directors of the State Banking Company.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it has yet been decided to take any steps in regard to the prosecution of the directors of the State Banking Corporation, Limited, or to drop any proceedings.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) I can only tell the hon. Member that the matter is still under consideration.

London and North-Western Railway Company and Dissection of Rates for Goods.

SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that the London and North-Western Railway Company recently declined to furnish a firm of iron manufacturers who applied to them for the dissection of certain rates under Section 33, Subsection 3, of The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, with particulars of the nature and detail of the terminal expenses included in such rates; and whether, in view of the refusal of the London and North-Western Railway Company, and of the importance of the right to obtain these particulars to traders and agriculturists, he will exercise the powers conferred upon his Department by Section 6 of The Regulation of Railways Act, 1873, with the object of compelling the London and North-Western Railway Company to comply with the application referred to in this Question.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) If particulars are supplied of the rates referred to I shall be prepared to ask the railway company for an explanation in the matter, as provided by Section 31 of The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888. Section 6 of the Act of 1873, referred to by the hon. Member, confers no powers on the Board of Trade with respect to the enforcement of Section 33 of the Act of 1888, which is a matter for a court of summary jurisdiction and not for the Railway and Canal Commission.

Complaints against Local Councils under the Public Health Act, 1875.

MR. WEIR: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the names of the twelve district councils against whom complaints were made during the years 1905 and 1906 in respect of default in the performance of their duty as required under Section 299 of The Public Health Act, 1875.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The names of the district councils whose cases were dealt with in the two years are as follows:—

In 1905—

Dunmow Rural.
Eastbourne Rural.
Epsom Rural.
Penybont Rural.
South Darley Urban.

In 1906—

Bromley Rural.
Cricklade and Wootton Bassett Rural.
Dunmow Rural.
Eastbourne Rural.
Hebburn Urban.
Lymington Rural.
Rye Rural.

The cases of the Dunmow and Eastbourne Rural District Councils, which were partially dealt with in 1905, were further dealt with in 1906.

Annual Cost of Metropolitan Asylum Carlshalton.

Dr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the annual amount of the interest, sinking fund, and cost of maintenance of the hospital for convalescent fever patients erected by the Metropolitan Asylums Board at Carshalton; whether the consent of the Local Government Board had to be obtained before the hospital could be erected; if so, whether any inquiry was made by the Local Government Board into the necessity of such hospital, and also the suitability of the site; and whether, as the hospital is unused, and there is great want of asylum accommodation in the county of London for imbecile and harmless senile lunatics, he will consider the advisability of requiring the Metropolitan Asylums Board using this hospital for such a purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The annual charge in respect of the items referred to is in round sums as follows:—

	£
Interest - - - - -	7,500
Repayment of principal - -	8,000
Cost of maintenance (about) - -	2,000

The debt is repaid by equal annual instalments of principal, so that the charge for interest diminishes each year. The consent of the Local Government Board had to be obtained to the erection of the hospital. Before any consent was given a public inquiry was held by inspectors of the Board, at which the need for the hospital and the suitability of the site were considered. As I stated on 25th July, in reply to a Question by my hon. friend the Member for the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow, the question of the use of the hospital for other purposes than that for which it was provided has not been lost sight of, either by the Board or the managers, and it will be again considered as soon as circumstances permit, but until the existing prevalence of fever has abated it is thought desirable that the accommodation afforded by this hospital should be held in reserve. I have promised to continue to give attention to the matter, but meanwhile I am glad to learn that the demands on the managers in respect of imbeciles and harmless senile lunatics are not such as to point to any great want of accommodation for these classes at the present time.

Assistance of Blind Persons in the County of London.

Mr. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the number of adult blind persons in the county of London and the number of adult blind persons for whom accommodation can be found in existing workshops for the blind; and whether he can hold out any hope of Government assistance towards meeting the shortage, if any, in workshop accommodation, in order that blind persons may be enabled to earn their own living instead of becoming a charge upon the rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am not able to give the figures, but I would point out that the Royal Commission of 1889 recommended that the State should not directly subsidise the work of the blind, but that it should be left to private benevolence to establish workshops for them. I cannot hold out any hope of Government assistance.

Detention of Children awaiting Trial.

Mr. A. ALLEN: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that children brought into a police station after the court has risen for the day are frequently compelled to pass the night either in the cells or in the charge room; and whether he can undertake to deal with this point in the legislation affecting children which has been promised.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) My attention has been frequently directed to this question, and the point shall be further considered in connection with the legislation respecting children which is to be prepared for next session.

Control of Motor Cars—Traffic.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hatton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the case of motor vehicles emitting offensive vapours in public highways in the metropolitan police district, constables have instructions to interfere to stop the nuisance without waiting to be first requested to do so by persons complaining.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I fear that it is not in my power or that of the Commissioner to give constables the instructions which my right hon. friend suggests. If he will refer to Paragraph 142 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars he will see what the difficulty is.

Mr. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what orders are given to the metropolitan police with regard to the control of motor cars in London that, by reason of their noise and smell, or both, become a public nuisance; and whether penal regulations will now be more stringently enforced in cases where the nuisance is caused by neglect in cleaning the engines and by over-lubrication.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The police cannot take any action with respect to noise and smell against motor cars other than cabs and omnibuses. The only remedy is for the person aggrieved to take proceedings against the owner for a nuisance. This matter is dealt with in the Report of the recent Royal Commission, and I understand that the Local Government Board propose to amend the Law when an opportunity for legislation can be found. Motor omnibuses and cabs when unduly noisy are required to have their defects remedied. During the year ending 30th June last, 3,137 of them were so dealt with for noise and 257 for smoky exhaust.

Estate Schools in Eastern Bengal.

Mr. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has now received Captain Kennedy's Report on estate schools in Eastern Bengal and Assam; and, if so, will he consider the expediency of laying it upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Report has not yet been received.

Repayments towards Capital by Mr. R. Pearson, of Clonmore.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state by what amount was the capital reduced each year during the first decade of payment made by Mr. Robert Pearson, Clonmore, Errill, Ballybrophy, Queen's County, to the Land Commission of the advance made him in 1878 for the purchase of the property known as Ballyquaide Glebe, Ballybrophy, Queen's County.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that in this case the repayments towards capital in the several years of the first decade of repayment amounted to the following sums:—

	£	s.	d.
Year 1878	16	0	5
,, 1879	16	13	2
,, 1880	17	6	6
,, 1881	18	0	6
,, 1882	18	15	3
,, 1883	19	10	3
,, 1884	20	6	0
,, 1885	21	2	10
,, 1886	21	19	2
,, 1887	22	17	4

Owner of Warrenford Estate, Garronmaconally.

Mr. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state who is the owner of Warrenford Estate, Garronmaconally, Ballybrophy, the rents of which are collected by Mr. Matthew Franks, Westfield, Mountrath; whether the rents are paid into the Court of Chancery; and can he say to whom the tenants should apply for terms of purchase.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that the owner of the estate in question is Mr. John R. K. Warneford, of Glasgow. The estate is not in Chancery.

Veterinary Interests on the Belfast Health Commission.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that no member of the Health Commission sitting at Belfast is a veterinary surgeon, or other person equally qualified to examine meat and dairy inspectors, with the result that the Commission have been unable to enter fully into the diseases of animals transmissible to man; whether seeing the interest the public are now taking in the necessity of pure food and milk, he can see his way to have a veterinary surgeon or some other person with equal qualifications appointed as Local Government Board inspector to advise local authorities on such matters; and, if not, will he consider the advisability of transferring this work to the veterinary branch of the Board of Agriculture.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It is the fact that no veterinary surgeon has been appointed to the Commission referred to, but the two Local Government medical inspectors and the Medical Officer of Health of Glasgow, who are on the Commission, appear to be eminently fitted to deal with questions of milk and meat supply. Local authorities have power to appoint as inspectors veterinary surgeons to advise them upon these questions. I am not aware of any reason for transferring public health duties to the Department of Agriculture.

Inspection of Food and Meat.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a meeting of the Royal Sanitary Institute held a few days ago at Douglas, where Sir Charles Cameron, medical officer of health for Dublin, stated that the central body should themselves carry out, or insist on the local authorities carrying out, a more complete inspection of food and meat; and whether, in view of the resolution that was passed at a meeting of the Veterinary Medical Association in Belfast on 26th ultimo to the effect that such inspection should be conducted only by trained veterinarians, he can say what steps, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The hon. Member has sent to me a newspaper report of the proceedings referred to, but the official report has not yet been issued. The Local Government Board have received a copy of the resolution passed by the Veterinary Surgeons' Association in Belfast. Under the law as it stands the appointment of inspectors of food and meat rests with the local authorities, and they have full power to appoint veterinary surgeons in that capacity.

Delay in Purchase of the Ballydoyle Estates, County Cork.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the cause of the delay by the Estates Commissioners in dealing with the purchase of the Ballydoyle estate of Major Eustace, Castletownroche, county Cork, concerning which an originating application has been lodged for a considerable time; and whether anything remains to be done by the vendor or the purchasing tenants to expedite the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that there has been no undue delay in connection with the proceedings for the sale of this estate. The originating request was lodged on 22nd April last, and the documents to prove the vendor's title were received as recently as the 18th July. It is not possible at present to reply to the concluding part of the Question.

Good Service Awards to Irish School Teachers.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Rule 19 of the Commissioners' New Rules and Regulations, issued as a Parliamentary Paper on 13th July, 1900, stated that awards of good service salary would be made to teachers when the work done was satisfactory, and that reasonable progress was made in the proficiency of the children, and that the rule of the Commissioners is that promotion depends on training, position in school, ability and general attainments, good service, and seniority; whether he is aware that teachers of the second grade, in schools having the necessary average, whose Reports for the triennial period ending 31st March, 1906, were good, have been refused promotion; and whether, having regard to the training, position, ability and general attainments and seniority of the teachers concerned, he would see that they were promoted to the first grade.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that Rule 19 referred to in the Question had reference only to the award of increments of good service salary, and not to the promotion of teachers from grade to grade. The general rule as to promotion was No. 7 of the Rules quoted in the Parliamentary Paper referred to, and the application of that rule was contingent upon other rules set forth in the Parliamentary Paper. The Commissioners have found it necessary to fix standards of proficiency for promotion from grade to grade. They have fixed a comparatively low standard for promotion from the third to the second grade, a higher standard for promotion from the second grade to the second division of first grade, and the highest standard for promotion from the second division to the first division of first grade. The Commissioners cannot express an opinion as to the cases of teachers who have been refused promotion unless full particulars of each individual case are before them. If the claims of any such teachers should be submitted to the Commissioners they will receive careful consideration.

Uniform Establishment for Short Service Battalions.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it has now been decided that all the short-service battalions of the Regular Army which are to be formed out of the existing Militia are to have a uniform establishment; and, if so, what will that establishment be.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is proposed that all the special contingent battalions shall have a similar establishment, and that this establishment shall be about 580 special contingent non-commissioned officers and men.

The Imperial Service Medal.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any person in the service of the State who is not a pensioner would be eligible for an Imperial Service medal; and, if so, what would the qualification be.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. The Imperial Service medal is confined to members of the Civil Services who are not eligible for appointment as companions of the Imperial Service Order. It is granted only on retirement after not less than twenty-five years' service at home or sixteen years' service in a Colony or Protectorate recognised as unhealthy under the Pension Acts or regulations applying to it. It may, however, in special circumstances be granted to civil servants who have retired after less than the above-mentioned service, provided that not more than five such grants are made in any one year.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Mobilisation of the Home Fleet.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if official notification was given to the Home Fleet twelve days before the date of the recent mobilisation; and when have the Admiralty tested the instant readiness for war by a surprise mobilisation of this fleet as at present organised.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): No surprise mobilisation has been carried out since last year. That was entirely satisfactory, and the conditions are now more favourable.

Royal Marines and the Mobilisation.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if, in the Devonport command, it was found necessary to utilise the Royal Marines in order to make good deficiencies in the naval ratings during the recent mobilisation.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: A certain number of Marines were embarked at Devonport principally in lieu of bandsmen and domestics, and some in lieu of Naval ratings. These Naval ratings were and are available, but were retained for duties in connection with the refit of the schools.

Reserve of Battleship Guns.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the number of 12-inch guns in reserve has been increased beyond the proportion of one in four of guns mounted on His Majesty's battleships; and, if not, if that proportion is still maintained.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON; I beg to refer the hon. Member to my Answer to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for King's Lynn on the 19th March last.†

Queenstown Deputation.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.); I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether he is in a position to make any statement concerning the matter which was brought to his notice by the deputation which waited upon him during his recent visit to Queenstown.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: A letter conveying the decision of the Admiralty will be sent immediately to the Rear-Admiral at Queenstown, through whom the original application was made.

French War Craft in the Mediterranean.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many separate French Mediterranean stations for torpedo craft there are in the South of France, Corsica, and on the North African coast; and what is the number of destroyers, torpedo boats, and submarines belonging to France in the Mediterranean.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The information desired is as follows—

	Destroyers.	Torpedo Boats.
1st Mediterranean Flotilla (Toulon) . . .	4	55
2nd ,, ,, (Ajaccio) . . .	1	18
3rd ,, ,, (Bizerta) . . .	2	19
4th ,, ,, (Algiers) . . .	1	11
5th ,, ,, (Oran) . . .	1	18

1st Flotilla of Submarines (Toulon), 11.
2nd ,, ,, ,, (Bizerta), 4.

In addition to the five ports mentioned above, there are sixteen stations in connection with the *Defense Mobile* of the Mediterranean. The above numbers are from the Voted French Naval Estimates for 1907, pages 216 and 217.

Loch Long Torpedo Range.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to the proposed torpedo range in Loch Long, what are the names and dates of the Dumbartonshire newspapers, if any, in which the nature of the scheme was advertised; what communications were made on the subject, and on what dates, to the county council of Dumbartonshire or to any of the parish councils of that county, and what was the nature of the replies received; whether he is aware that various local interests in that county, particularly the interests of those who let houses and cater for summer visitors at Arrochar, at the head of the loch, will be seriously affected; and whether there have been any communications with them.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The notice given does not enable me to Answer the large number of queries contained in this Question, but a communication will be addressed to the hon. Member respecting the facilities to be allowed to objectors beyond the date specified in the notices.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 651–2.

MR. J. D. WHITE: As the time specified expires to-morrow, will the right hon. Gentleman use his influence to allow an extension of a fortnight?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I will consult with my hon. friend.

Eltham Common.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any decision has been arrived at with regard to building upon Eltham Common by the War Office.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): It has been decided not to proceed with the proposed buildings on Eltham Common.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Will the right hon. Gentleman stop the cutting down of trees?

MR. HALDANE: Serious military considerations are involved in that.

Public Accounts Committee's Report.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the changes of policy mentioned in paragraph 40 of the Second Report from the Committee of Public Accounts as being the cause of the loss of public money were suggested by the Committee of Defence, by the Army Council, or by other military advisers of His Majesty's Government.

MR. HALDANE: As I have already informed the House, the Prime Minister has promised that an opportunity shall be given to the House of discussing the Public Accounts Committee's Report, and I must ask the hon. Member, as I have asked other hon. Members, to postpone any question arising out of that Report until the debate in question is reached.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E): When will that be?

MR. HALDANE: I have nothing whatever to do with that.

Flax Transport in St. Helena.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the need for facilitating the transport of flax in St. Helena, the Colonial Office will recommend that a grant-in-aid be made for the maintenance of the roads in the island, which are rapidly falling into decay from lack of funds for keeping them in repair.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): I fear I can only refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave to the hon. Member for Gravesend on the 23rd of July.† The question of the transport of flax has not yet arisen.

St. Helena Flax Industry—Mr. Fulton's Report.

MR. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of Mr. Fulton, the flax expert from New Zealand, who visited St. Helena and reported upon the prospects of starting a flax industry in the island.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State considers that it would hardly serve any useful purpose to lay on the Table a preliminary Report which it may very possibly be necessary to modify in some particulars as the result of further experience of St. Helena.

Railway Rates in Southern Nigeria.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has stated that the rate of carriage on spirits in Southern Nigeria is 52s. per ton on the Government railway as compared with 35s. per ton on palm oil and 33s. on salt; whether, in fact, this rate applies only to carriage by rail between Lagos and Ibadan, whereas the rate to Abeokuta is only 16s. per ton on spirits as against 18s. for provisions and 49s. for kerosene oil; and whether, with a view to checking consumption by the natives, the rate of carriage will be largely increased.

MR. CHURCHILL: The rates quoted by the Secretary of State in another place on 27th February last‡ are, as suggested by the hon. Member, those in force between Lagos and Ibadan. I may point out that Lord Elgin stated that "the policy has been adopted of keeping the rates as high as possible without driving trade to the carriers," and it so happens that between Lagos and Abeokuta the railway is in active competition with the canoe transport on the river Ogun, which runs from Abeokuta to the Lagos lagoon. Although this competition is not serious in the case of certain classes of goods which might suffer by the risks incidental to canoe transport, it is certain that a large increase in the railway rates for the carriage of spirits would merely have the effect of diverting the carriage to the river. It may be mentioned that all spirits brought into Abeokuta are subject to a local tax of 9d. a gallon, payable in addition to the duties paid on importation, so that the price of spirits in the town is correspondingly increased.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1349–50.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 15.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Do not native carriers already carry spirits cheaper than the railway company?

MR. CHURCHILL: I think that is so.

Lagos Duties on Spirits.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Lagos Government used to levy an import duty of 110 francs per hectolitre on spirits imported into the Colony, when the legal minimum under the Brussels Conference Act was seventy francs per hectolitre; and whether, as the legal minimum has now been raised to 100 francs per hectolitre by the Brussels Conference of last November, the Lagos Government propose to maintain the precedent which they have hitherto set by raising their duty to a corresponding height above the present legal minimum.

MR CHURCHILL: The duty previously levied on spirits amounted to 96 francs a hectolitre (not 110 francs). The Brussels Conference fixed the minimum duty at 100 francs a hectolitre, but before the act of the Conference was ratified steps had already been taken to raise the duty in Lagos to 110 francs. This increase took effect in December last, and it is not at present proposed to make any further alteration.

Second Ballots at Elections.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will consider the advisability of bringing up to date and republishing any information in the possession of the Foreign Office on the regulations and methods guiding the application of the second ballot at elections in foreign countries?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): His Majesty's representatives in Europe and the United States will be instructed to furnish reports for publication showing the regulations and methods which guide the application of the second ballot in those countries in which it is in force.

Egyptian Students in Europe.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the sum of £E3,400 in the credit of £E68,329 recently granted to the Egyptian Ministry of Education is the sole provision made for sending students to Europe; and, if so, whether there can be any hope that the promises recently made of an increase in the *personnel* of qualified Egyptian teachers will be fulfilled.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have at present no information on the subject, but will make inquiries.

Unstable Buildings in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can obtain an official statement of the number of buildings which have collapsed in Alexandria, Cairo, and their environs within the last twelve months, and the number of persons who have been thereby killed or injured.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will inquire whether it is possible to obtain such a statement.

Cairo Water Supply.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign

Affairs whether, in view of the fact that a number of houses in Cairo, near the Boghos Pasha Bridge, are without water supply, and that the Cairo Water Company, though repeatedly appealed to by the proprietors to meet their needs, has done nothing, he will suggest to the Egyptian Government the expediency of acting on the long-standing demand for the establishment of a Cairo municipality which can meet the requirements of the city.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information on the particular point of the water supply and the contract with the water company. The question of the municipality is a large and complicated one, with which I am not prepared to deal at present.

Newfoundland Fisheries.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the American Government insist that American fishermen must be protected against the application of a law passed by the self-governing Colony of Newfoundland regulating the herring fishery within Treaty waters; if so, what course has been taken by this Government; and whether the Government is endeavouring to arrange a *modus vivendi* for the present fishing season.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As negotiations are now proceeding with the United States Government on the whole question of American rights under the Treaty of 1818, I am unable to make any statement on this subject.

The Hague Conference and the Limitation of Armaments.

CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is in a position to announce the terms of the Resolution dealing with the limitation of armaments to be moved by the British delegates at the Hague.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I must refer to the Answer I gave to the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division of Sheffield on the 23rd of last month,† to which I have nothing at present to add.

CAPTAIN FABER: Is it the intention of the Government, after the Conference, to lay before the House any account of its proceedings?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will inquire what was done in connection with the last Hague Conference. I assume we shall follow the same course as on the previous occasion.

LORD BALCARRES: Will the British delegates table a Resolution, and, if so, what will be the terms of it?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No Resolution has been tabled, and I cannot say what may be the terms of one, but I think it would be desirable whatever Resolution is brought forward it should be one generally acceptable.

MR. LEA: Will full information be granted before the House rises, considering the fact that the cost of a British battleship hangs on the result?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I do not know when the proceedings of the Conference will be concluded.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): In regard to laying the proceedings of the Conference before the House, do the Government consider themselves bound by precedent, or would it not be possible to do better?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I must first know what was done last time.

The Sugar Convention.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether this Government have received any statement of the terms upon which the permanent International Sugar Committee have submitted a draft to enable Great Britain to remain a party to the Sugar Convention.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Yes, Sir; the draft protocol drawn up by the International Sugar Commission has been received by His Majesty's Government. But the Commission expressed the opinion that it should not be published till it had been accepted by the Governments concerned.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxviii., 1358-9.

Ben Nevis Observatories.

SIR J. DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is now in a position to say whether he is able to accede to the request of the Scottish Members of Parliament for a grant to the Scottish Meteorological Society for the purpose of reopening and maintaining the Ben Nevis Observatories.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The only scheme which has up to the present been placed before me is one under which the whole cost of the re-equipment and maintenance of the observatories would be thrown upon public funds, and to this I should not feel justified in assenting. I am, however, quite prepared to consider the question of renewing the Government grant, which was for many years given to these institutions through the Meteorological Council, provided that an adequate contribution towards their re-establishment and maintenance is forthcoming from other sources.

MR. LEA: Will the right hon. Gentleman withhold any grant for the purpose until the full amount allotted by Parliament for the relief of the unemployed is exhausted?

[No Answer was returned.]

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman give any idea what would be considered an adequate contribution?

MR. ASQUITH: No Sir.

Land Legislation—the Government and Existing Contracts.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the declaration made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the United Provident Institution on 10th July last, to the effect that it was quite certain that existing contracts would be respected, and that there was no intention of ripping up obligations which had been incurred in good faith, and that any legislation would proceed with that idea as its starting point, was made with the concurrence and approval of His Majesty's Government; and, if so, whether the declaration that existing contracts would be respected is interpreted by His Majesty's Government as applying to existing contracts between landlord and tenant in England and Wales for the payment of rates and taxes.

MR. ASQUITH: I have no reason to doubt that my colleagues concur in the statement referred to by my hon. friend. So far as I am aware, there are no proposals of legislation now before Parliament which give rise to the latter part of his Question.

Case of Florence Doughty.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether any consideration can be given to the case of Florence Doughty, who has now been detained over three years in Broadmoor Asylum; and whether, looking at the special circumstances of the case, he will consider the desirability of releasing her.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have had this case frequently under my careful consideration, but I do not feel justified in taking any action at present. It is two years since Miss Doughty's conviction, and she has been in Broadmoor Asylum for one year and eight months.

The Training Ship "Exmouth."

DR. COOPER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state if any of the travelling expenses of the large number of guardians and their friends who were invited to Grays by the Metropolitan Asylums Board on 27th July, to the 31st annual inspection of the training ship "Exmouth," will become a charge upon the rates, and, if so, to what account; and whether the luncheon which followed the distribution of prizes was paid for out of public money or by private subscription.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am informed that the travelling expenses of all the visitors invited by the Metropolitan Asylums Board to the inspection of the "Exmouth" were paid by the visitors themselves. The cost of the luncheon was defrayed, in the case of the persons invited by individual members of the Asylums Board by the members inviting them, and, in the case of the visitors invited by the Board, by the Chairman.

Unemployment—Local Committees and the Central Body.

MR. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware of the fact that the local advisory committees in London are unable to obtain copies of the resolutions passed by the central body; and whether he will make representations to the central body with reference to this matter with a view to securing greater co-operation in the organisation of this work.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The circulation of the minutes and agenda of the Central Body is in the hands of their finance committee. I understand that the Employment Exchanges Committee, on the suggestion of certain local advisory committees, stated that they saw no objection to the supply of these minutes and agenda to the superintendents of local exchanges. The Finance Committee, however, considered it neither necessary nor expedient to supply the minutes and agenda, as distinct from the supply of necessary information relating to the work of the exchanges. If, as I infer, this information is supplied, the case would seem to be sufficiently met. I may add that the distress committees as statutory bodies under the Act are supplied with the agenda and minutes.

The Unemployed and Labour Disputes.

MR. CARR-GOMM: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Central Unemployed Committee in London issues any instructions to the superintendents of the local labour exchange registries or to the local advisory committees with reference to their attitude towards firms or trades in which a strike is taking place; and, if so, what is the nature of these instructions.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am informed that no formal by-law has at present been made as to the action of the employment exchanges in trade disputes; but that it is the intention both of the Central Body and of the Employment Exchange Committee to prevent the unfair use of the exchanges to prejudice the conduct of trade disputes. I understand that an instruction has been issued to each superintendent to the effect that, in the event of a dispute arising in his district, he should at once notify the same to the central office and not take any action in respect of employment vacated or workmen unemployed owing to such dispute before receiving the express instructions of the Employment Exchanges Committee in the particular case.

London Docks Bill.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to deal with the London Docks next session; and, if so, whether it will include the development of deep-water jetties down the river to Gravesend and beyond.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): It is the intention of my right hon. friend to introduce a Bill dealing with the Port of London next session; but I am not prepared at the present moment to make any statement as to the details of the Bill.

Cape Colony Trade Statistics.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if last half-year's trade statistics for Cape Colony show a distinct increase in the proportion of British trade as compared with foreign trade; whether this increase is due to the policy of preference; and will the Government reconsider its decision at the Colonial Conference not to give preference to wine from Cape Colony.

MR. KEARLEY: The trade statistics for Cape Colony for June have not yet been received, but those for the five months ending May show an increase in the proportion of British as compared with foreign trade, though imports both British and foreign have declined in actual amount. The Customs Union Convention of 1906 increased the general level of import duties while leaving practically unchanged the proportionate rate of rebate on British goods. I cannot undertake to say how far the changes shown in the trade statistics are the result of preference. They do not, however, appear to necessitate any modification in the views of His Majesty's Government as expressed at the Imperial Conference.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Did not the President of the Board of Trade say the increase was due to preference?

MR. KEARLEY: I cannot answer for my right hon. friend.

Grantown-on-Spey Telephones.

MR. A. WILLIAMSON (Elgin and Nairn): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is the case that the National Telephone Company agreed to introduce immediately the telephone system into Grantown-on-Spey if the Government granted the necessary sanction; if the National Telephone Company did accordingly ask for the sanction of the Government in 1906, and again in February last; if the Government refused; and, if so, as the Government have not themselves taken any steps to meet this public need by introducing the Post Office telephone system, will they now grant the required sanction to the National Telephone Company in order that the burgh may not, for another season, be deprived of telephonic communication.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): The National Telephone Company did apply for an extension of the Elgin Exchange area to include Granton-on-Sey, but the connection of Grantown with the trunk line system at Elgin would be much less satisfactory than a direct connection with Inverness. The proposal therefore was not sanctioned. If sufficient local support could be obtained, or if a moderate guarantee were given, my right hon. friend would be prepared to set up an exchange at Grantown; and he will have a canvas made without delay.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrew's Burghs): Can the hon. and gallant Member give the House any idea of what is considered an adequate guarantee?

CAPTAIN NORTON: I am not in a position to state that.

Masters of Endowed Schools. "Wright *v.* Zetland and Others."

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the case of "Wright *v.* Zetland and others," tried before Mr. Justice Lawrance on 17th and 18th July last; and whether, in view of the responsibility which the decision in that case throws upon all head masters of endowed schools as employers of assistant masters engaged under them, he is prepared to advise any action with regard to the revision of schemes now extant or to propose further legislation on the subject.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): My right hon. friend's attention has been called to this case, but, as it is probable that the decision will be appealed against, it would be improper for me to make any statement at present. The question of further modifying the provisions of existing and future schemes in respect of the tenure of office by assistant masters is receiving consideration as cases arise.

MR. MALLET: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, by the provisions of the Public Schools Act, 1868, and the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, head masters and assistant masters in public and endowed schools are liable to dismissal without notice; and, if so, whether he is prepared to consider the desirability of recommending further legislation on this subject.

MR. LOUGH: The provisions referred to provide for the dismissal of head and assistant masters "at pleasure," and I am advised that this expression does not necessarily or in all cases mean "without notice." This point will probably be elucidated in the course of further proceedings in the case of "Wright *v.* Zetland and others," and before considering whether legislation is necessary or desirable I must obviously await a final decision in that case.

Parkgate and Neston Schools.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education under what circumstances it is intended to force the Neston and Parkgate Urban District

Council to erect additional school accommodation at added cost in rates when there is sufficient room for all the children in existing schools.

MR. LOUGH: One of the existing schools in this district is conducted in temporary premises which are not suitable for permanent use. The Board are urging the local education authority to provide a permanent building to replace it.

The Official Debates.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the fact that he is unable to provide an opportunity during the present session for the consideration by the House of the Report of the Select Committee on Parliamentary Debates, he can state at what date the existing contract for reporting terminates, or whether it is necessary to give any and what notice to terminate it; and whether it is proposed to renew the contract temporarily until the House has arrived at some decision upon the subject.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The existing contract terminates on 31st December next. The arrangements to be made for next session are under consideration, and I am not able to make any statement on the subject at present.

Ordnance Survey—Case of Mr. John Gardner.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether Mr. John Gardner, of the 7th Division, Ordnance Survey, of an admitted excellent character and nearly ten years service, is under notice of discharge by 10th August on the sole ground that, in consequence of the completion of the 25-inch Survey of Louth, Ireland, there is no employment for him as a surveyor or plotter in Lancashire, which county the 7th Division is about to revise; whether he is aware that Mr. Gardner holds the qualification of a reviser, entitling him adequately to perform such work as is contemplated in Lancashire; and that he has also been employed on three other duties, *i.e.*, computing, tracing, and stamping; and whether, considering the nature of the survey duties, and the consequent difficulty of discharged men obtaining similar work elsewhere, he will arrange to have Mr. Gardner transferred either to Lancashire or to some other division in Scotland or England where he may be employed in any of the six above-mentioned capacities; or whether, failing this, employment will be found for him in the General Post Office, Edinburgh, where, for three years prior to joining the survey, he was employed as a tracer.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): Mr. Gardner is being discharged for the reason stated in my hon. friend's Question. The qualifications he possesses to which my hon. friend refers were taken into consideration in dealing with his case, but he could not be retained in the service without displacing some other man with stronger claims to retention.

MR. A. DEWAR: Is this exceptionally qualified public servant to be allowed to render no further service to the State?

MR. J. A. PEASE: I have no personal knowledge of the matter.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Give him a public grant.

Walpole House Farm, Norfolk.

MR. GRETTON: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what rent per acre has the syndicate agreed to pay for the Crown land on the Walpole House Farm, Norfolk, which it is proposed to convert into small holdings; and what will be the size of the holdings.

MR. J. A. PEASE: The rent for this land when equipped with the necessary houses and buildings will be about 31s. per acre, the same rent as that at which the rest of the farm with the farmhouse and principal buildings has been let to the son of the late tenant. The exact allocation of the land has not, it is understood, been definitely settled, but it is expected that there will be created about twenty-eight holdings of various sizes, and that fourteen of the tenants will be resident on the land.

Donegal Evicted Tenants—Case of John Monaghan.

MR. C. MACVEIGH (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been called to the case of John Monaghan, who was evicted from his farm on the estate of Elizabeth Stokes, county Donegal, and has been refused either reinstatement or compensation; and, if so, whether he can state why he was so refused.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners have received from John Monaghan an application for reinstatement and have had full inquiries made in the case. The Commissioners have refused the application upon the ground that the applicant is not suitable to work land; and for other reasons which it is not desirable to state.

The O'Donoghue Estate, Kerry.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners propose to give any assistance to Denis T. Dineen, of Derrynafinnia, county Kerry, whose holding on the O'Donoghue estate was inspected a long time ago.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received Denis Dineen's application for a grant, and will give it due consideration.

Morrogh Bernard Estate, Kerry.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have yet sanctioned the terms of sale on the Morrogh Bernard estate, county Kerry; and whether he will take steps to ensure that the claims of Monty Buckley and Timothy Buckley, two evicted tenants on the estate, are first satisfactorily dealt with.

MR. BIRRELL: The advances applied for in the case of this estate have not yet been sanctioned. The Estates Commissioners are prepared to have the two evicted tenants reinstated upon terms which have been communicated to them, and which the Commissioners consider fair. If these men do not agree to the terms, the sale of the estate cannot be further delayed on their account.

MR. MURPHY: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that no coercion is used in this matter?

MR. BIRRELL: At any rate the men must make up their minds in a reasonable time.

MR. MURPHY: Will the right hon. Gentleman prevent any unfair pressure being used?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no reason to believe that there will be any.

Ballybricken Estate, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, can he say whether negotiations for sale and purchase as between Mr. Kelly, of Islandmore, Croom, county Limerick, and his tenants on the Ballybricken property in county Limerick, have as yet been brought before the Estates Commissioners; can he say whether Mr. Kelly is selling his untenanted land on that estate to the Estates Commissioners; have the Commissioners sent an inspector, at the request of Mr. Robert Barry, with the view of giving him land in Rockstown, from which his people were some time since evicted; and is the farm which Mr. Barry claims untenanted, or is it occupied by a tenant; and, if so, what is the tenant's name.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace any proceedings as having been instituted before them in respect of the estate mentioned in the Question.

Dunraven Estate, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that in the sale to the tenants of the Dunraven property through the Estates Commissioners a tenant named John Micks, of Graigne, Adare, county Limerick, could not see his way to purchase owing to the fact that in the exchange of part of his land, to accommodate Lord Dunraven, for a portion of land adjoining, considerably less in extent and value, for which Mr. Micks was promised £8 reduction in his rent, but did not afterwards receive it; and will he see that the Estates Commissioners will use their best endeavours to bring about an arrangement between Lord Dunraven and Mr. Micks, so that he may be placed in the same category as his brother tenants.

MR. BIRRELL: Lord Dunraven's estate, of which the holding referred to forms part, has been purchased by the Land Commission. The exchange mentioned in the Question was effected by agreement between Lord Dunraven and Mr. Micks before the sale to the Land Commission took place. Mr. Micks has refused to purchase his holding from the Commissioners on the terms offered by them, and he is, therefore, now their tenant. Lord Dunraven has no further concern with the matter.

Mr. Commissioner Bailey.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of the resolution adopted on Saturday by the Ballymena Rural Council condemning the attempt to intimidate Mr. Commissioner Bailey, and calling upon the Government to place the Estates Commissioners in a position that will enable them to ignore the threats of biassed or interested partisans; whether he is aware that the members of this council are Unionists in politics; and whether steps will be taken to give effect to the suggestion of the council.

MR. BIRRELL: I have seen the resolution referred to, but have no information as to the politics of the rural district council. As regards the remainder of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to Clause 12 of the Evicted Tenants Bill which has been before this House for some time past.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that the resolution of this Unionist body is brought under the notice of the House of Lords?

MR. BIRRELL: I will see to that.

Waterford Lunatic Asylum.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the action of Dr. Oakshott, the resident medical superintendent of the district lunatic asylum, Waterford, in recently issuing an order through the head attendant for the information of subordinates to the effect that under no circumstances were they allowed to bring the local paper called the *Munster Express* into the institution; if he can state by whose authority Dr. Oakshott has issued such an order; and whether he will take steps to remove this discrimination against a local paper.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that the fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. Dr. Oakshott issued the order under the authority conferred upon him by regulation No. 95 of the regulations for the management of the institution made by the Asylums Committee with the sanction of the Lord-Lieutenant. That regulation provides, amongst other things, that no attendant shall be allowed to introduce amongst the patients any newspapers without the sanction of the resident medical superintendent. Dr. Oakshott's reason for prohibiting the circulation of the paper in the asylum is stated to have been that the paper had published objectionable and unfounded articles relative to the patients' diet, and that the reading of these articles had caused dissatisfaction and excitement among the patients. So far as I can judge from the facts before me, Dr. Oakshott does not seem to have exceeded his powers, but in any case, as I am at present advised, I should have no power to call for the revocation of the order.

Poor Law Inspectors.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for West Wicklow I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he explain why there are nine general inspectors and seven medical inspectors employed by the Local Government Board for 159 Poor Law unions in Ireland, and that for the 600 Poor Law unions in England there are fourteen general inspectors and two medical inspectors, making sixteen inspectors for England, and the same number for Ireland whose population is only about one-ninth the population of England; and, in view of these figures, can he explain why four more inspectors are to be employed in connection with the Labourers Act.

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Member's figures as regards England are not correct. He appears to have overlooked page 158 of this year's Estimates. There are in England eighteen medical inspectors as well as twenty-two inspectors who perform duties analogous to those of the Irish general inspectors. The number of these appointments is not determined by population alone. The areas of the districts, the poverty of the country, and the conditions of public health, have also to be considered. Moreover, the Irish Medical Charities Act has no counterpart in England. Additional inspectors are absolutely necessary to deal with the very large number of schemes which are being made under the new Labourers Act.

Rostrevor Rent Dispute.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board is aware that Messrs. R. and D. Martin of Kilbroney, Rostrevor, county Down, have served a notice of increased rent and also a notice to quit upon one of their workmen, James M'Guill, who had applied for a cottage under the Labourers Acts; whether the Board is aware that one of the firm has several times threatened to evict any labourer who seeks the benefit of the Labourers Acts; whether the firm opposed M'Guill's application for a cottage, although six men are at present housed in a wretched building; and whether full inquiry will be made into the conduct of Messrs. R. and D. Martin.

MR. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have no knowledge of the circumstances alleged in the Question, and even if the facts are as stated, the Board would have no power to interfere. I would, however, refer the hon. Member to Section 95 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, which provides that a labourer may obtain compensation if dismissed from his employment by reason of his having applied for a labourer's cottage.

Ballydoyle Evicted Tenant.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the present position of the case of Ralph V. Ladd, who has applied to the Estates Commissioners to reinstate him in his former holding at Ballydoyle, near Ballyhooley, county Cork, on the estate of Major C. L. E. Robertson-Eustace; what was the date of his eviction; what was the rent of the farm at that date; was the rent non-judicial, first term, or second term; how much was due at the date of the eviction; what is the area and Poor Law valuation of the farm; what is the amount of the purchase advance which the Estates Commissioners have agreed to make, exclusive of the bonus, to enable Ladd to purchase the holding; have they made or agreed to make any loan or free grant to Ladd to assist him to work the farm, and, if so, its amount; have they required him to give any security for the payment of the purchase annuity or of the rent pending the making of the advance, and, if so, with what result; has Ladd obtained any loan from the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and, if so, how much is now due thereon on foot of capital and arrears of annuity, respectively; and is Ladd now in occupation of the holding or any portion of it.

MR. BIRRELL: Major Eustace has expressed his willingness to accept the sum of £5,359 provisionally offered by the Estates Commissioners for the evicted farm in question, and Ralph Ladd is prepared to purchase the farm from the Commissioners at that price. The purchase, however, cannot be carried out until the owner has shown title. The date of the eviction is stated to have been 3rd September, 1902, and the rent at that date £233 per annum, apparently not judicial. One year's rent is stated to have been due at the date of the eviction. The Commissioners propose to make a free grant of £200 to Ladd to enable him to work the holding. Ladd has not yet been put in possession of the holding or any part of it, and therefore no necessity for requiring him to give security has arisen. Ladd himself has not obtained a loan from the Board of Works, but in 1895 the Board issued a loan of £220 to his predecessors in title as tenant. The total amount outstanding in respect of capital is £216 12s., part of which is not yet legally due. To this must be added the sum of £63 12s. 9d. interest included in

£150 arrears of annuity on the loan, and £40 3s. 3d. penalty interest, making a total of £320 8s., required to discharge the loan.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH: Are the Commissioners satisfied that Ladd is in every way a suitable tenant and able to pay the interest on the money?

MR BIRRELL: I presume they are, but I will make inquiries.

The Disturbances in Belfast.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) asked whether the Chief Secretary was aware of the latest developments of the Belfast labour dispute, and whether he could submit any substantial reason for the drafting into Belfast of 6,000 troops, which had practically placed the city under military control.

MR. BIRRELL: Everyone who has followed recent events connected with the strike in Belfast, and the action of a portion of the police force, must, I think, recognise that the circumstances demanded prompt and decided action. Although the number of soldiers has been temporarily increased, it is wholly incorrect to suggest that Belfast is practically under military rule. Whatever has been done there has been done in response to the requirements of the local civil authorities, who are still in command of the whole situation. I am glad to think there is very good reason to believe that this lamentable strike will very soon terminate.

MR. CURRAN asked whether the workmen had not agreed to submit their case to a Board ot Trade arbitrator, or any tribunal of impartial citizens, but that the steamship companies had absolutely refused overtures from any outside quarter, and that their obstinacy was the reason of the disastrous condition of things.

MR. BIRRELL: I do not think it would be useful if I were to appear to make myself a partisan, but it is the fact that I have offered to do all I could. That has not been found possible. I must leave it to the parties themselves.

MR. CURRAN inquired if members of the Royal Irish Constabulary were used to go on wagons belonging to the employers to protect their interest. Was that not using the forces of the Crown on behalf of the capitalistic interests in Belfast?

MR. BIRRELL: That is done simply to maintain the peace and order of the city.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) asked whether the influx of military was due to the disaffection among the police; whether the right hon. Gentleman had seen a petition of the police on the subject of their grievances, presented to the Inspector-General; whether Constable Barrett, who seemed to have played such a prominent part in the disaffection, was under suspension; and whether the right hon. Gentleman would order a full inquiry.

MR. BIRRELL: I rather deprecate full discussion of this question. We shall always be ready to consider the grievances of the police, but discipline must be maintained, and insubordination checked.

MR. SLOAN: I agree. But has the memorial setting forth the grievances of the police been presented, and is it the case that Constable Barrett has been suspended?

MR. BIRRELL: The reason for Constable Barrett's suspension is entirely satisfactory to my mind, and I do not think it desirable to discuss the matter further.

Irish Guaranteed Land Stock.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether it is intended to deprive purchasers under The Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, of the benefits conferred on them by Section 2 of that Act by the omission to make the rules necessary to make the section available; is he aware that Guaranteed Land Stock is freely dealt in on the Dublin Stock Exchange, and that any amount of it, large or small, can be readily purchased; if not so aware, will he inquire from some leading brokers.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I would refer to the answer which I gave to the hon.

Member for Carlow on the 9th ultimo.† As I then stated, Guaranteed Land Stock is accepted by the National Debt Commissioners in redemption of annuities payable in respect of advances made under the earlier Land Acts in the form of Guaranteed Land Stock. But it is impracticable, and having regard to the limited amount of the stock in the hands of the public, would be unjust as between one tenant-purchaser and another, to allow one-quarter of the annuity to be paid in stock. I need only add that the experience of the National Debt Commissioners as buyers of Guaranteed Land Stock does not confirm the statement that any amount of it, large or small, can be readily purchased.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: Has any Government Department the right to render a statute inoperative by omitting to make rules?

MR. RUNCIMAN: No Government Department is at liberty thus to make any portion of the Irish Land Act inoperative.

Imaal Camp Roads.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: On behalf of the hon. Member for county Wicklow, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that in reference to the cost of keeping in repair the roads leading to the camp at Imaal, county Wicklow, the War Office has received several communications from the chairman and secretary of the local district council; whether, since November last, the War Office has sent a reply to any of the letters from the local council; and, if not, can he give any explanation of the conduct of the War Office in this matter.

MR. HALDANE: Six letters have been received from the council, of which two were ordinary reminders, and four letters have been sent by the War Office in reply. Further, a private letter from the chairman was answered within a week. The arrangements made between the War Department and the council have been carried out by the former with the exception of the revision of the annual contribution, which is still under consideration. In the meantime payment of the annual contribution at the existing rate of £60 was made to the council.

Small Landowners (Scotland) Bill.

SIR JOHN DEWAR: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the interest attached to the early passing of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, can he say when the Report stage will be taken.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper on the same subject:—

MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): To ask the Prime Minister on what day he intends to take the Report stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.

MR. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs): To ask the Prime Minister whether the House will be asked to consider the Report stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill on an early day.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): We propose to take the Report stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill on Tuesday.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he thinks it is decent—[Cries of "Order"]—I repeat the expression—it is decent to take the Report stage on Tuesday, when the Scottish Grand Committee will be sitting the whole day, considering the Land Values Bill?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If I did not think it decent I should not propose it.

MR. YOUNGER: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it is quite fair?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We had better postpone the whole business indefinitely if we are to consider the convenience of Members on every occasion. The object is to pass certain Bills through the House in order to obviate the necessity of keeping the House of Lords especially waiting with nothing to do.

Parliamentary Officials and the Long Sittings.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the long sittings of the House at the present time and those which are likely to ensue before the session terminates, if he can state whether any arrangement has been made as to relieving or the payment of extra remuneration to the attendants, waiters, and policemen who are compelled to be on duty during the long sittings of the House; and, if so, what is the nature of such arrangement.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii. 1420.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that arrangements are made for relieving the attendants during late sittings of the House; and for an all-night sitting they receive extra remuneration, No additional money allowance is made to the police on duty at the Houses of Parliament on the occasion of late sittings, but the men are relieved for refreshments from time to time, and equivalent compensation in the shape of "time off" and special leave is given. With regard to the waiters, the hon. Gentleman had better address a question to the Chairman of the Kitchen Committee.

MR. SUMMERBELL: Is it not the fact that the attendants get 5s. if the House sets after six, and nothing if it rises a few minutes before six? Could not an arrangement be made to pay them by the hour?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have no doubt that if the present rule operates harshly the matter will be considered by the authorities.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): When the police are relieved for refreshments do they have to pay for them? Cannot they be given the refreshment?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The question of refreshments is an awkward one.

Discharges at Woolwich.

MR. CROOKS asked the Prime Minister whether before the end of the session he would afford an opportunity of discussing the abnormal discharges at Woolwich.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he sympathised with his hon. friend at being shut out from the discussion of this matter owing to the closing of Supply, but he was afraid no special measure could be taken to meet the case.

MR. CROOKS said that those who were interested in the matter were assured that, in the absence of a Motion for adjournment, they could discuss it on the Estimates.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN pointed out that unfortunate consequences of this kind were inevitable under the present mode of dealing with Supply. There was always a scramble at the end of the session, and this was the unfortunate result of a system which otherwise had great merits in many respects.

MR. CROOKS: It means disaster to a good many thousand households. I hope we shall have no Territorial Army Bill next year.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am pretty sure you will not.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) asked the Prime Minister what would be the business for Monday next; whether he proposed to sit late to-morrow (Friday), and, if so, what business would be taken after the Evicted Tenants Bill, which he understood was the first order.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that on Monday next there would be Motions allocating the time for further proceedings on the Scottish and English Land Bills. Report of the Scottish Bill would be taken on Tuesday, and continued on Wednesday and Thursday. He hoped the Third Reading would be taken on the Friday. As to the Bills to be taken at the end of their sittings, that was always a matter of agreement between different parts of the House, and he did not think it convenient to state anything definitely when it could be avoided. The Government had been disappointed on several occasions by finding that Bills which it had been arranged to take in those circumstances had been made the subject of protracted discussion, which was hardly what was understood to be intended in such a case.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS did not admit that there had been any breach of faith. The way to avoid mistake would be to make the matter clear across the floor of the House. He asked whether there would be two guillotine Motions on Monday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN replied that there would be two Motions —one for each Bill.

STANDING COMMITTEE C.

Ordered, That standing Committee C have leave to sit this day during the Sitting of the House.—(*Mr. Harcourt.*)

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Nicholas Joseph Murphy, esquire, for the the County of Kilkenny (South Kilkenny Division).

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND BOROUGH COUNCILS) BILL [LORDS.]

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 297.]

QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND TOWN COUNCILS (SCOTLAND) BILL [LORDS.]

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 298.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General, Dr. Macnamara, Sir Thomas Whittaker, Mr. Soares, Mr. Hooper, and Mr. Vaughan Davies; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. McKenna, Mr. Lough, Mr. Mallet, Mr. Acland Allen, Mr. Holt, and Mr. Charles H. Corbett.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee B the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Sir William Anson, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Viscount Morpeth, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Lardner, Mr. Haviland-Burke, Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. W. E. Harvey, Mr. Walter Rea, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, Mr. Helme, Mr. King, Mr. Bramsdon, Mr. Agnew, and Mr. Bateman Hope.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards and Mr. Hugh Law; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Curran and Mr. John O'Connor.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 299.]

NEW BILLS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

"To amend the Coal Mines Regulation Acts, 1887 to 1905, for the purpose of limiting hours of work below ground," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; supported by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 295.]

CABS AND STAGE CARRIAGES (LONDON) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Cabs and Stage Carriages in London," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; supported by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 296.]

SUPPLY [20TH ALLOTTED DAY] [31ST JULY].

Resolutions reported—

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,549,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Personnel for Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, &c., including the cost of Establishments of Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of

payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

Class I.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £312,432, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

		£
4.	Houses of Parliament Buildings (Supplementary) . . .	5,700
10.	Surveys of the United Kingdom . . .	118,905
11.	Harbours under the Board of Trade . .	16,740
12.	Peterhead Harbour .	21,988
14.	Public Works and Buildings, Ireland . .	122,829
15.	Railways, Ireland .	26,270
		312,432."

Class II.

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,182,699, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Service, viz. ;—

		£
1.	House of Lords Offices	17,543
2.	House of Commons Offices . . .	22,800
3.	Treasury and Subordinate Offices .	60,919
4.	Home Office . .	128,735
5.	Foreign Office . .	40,698
6.	Colonial Office (including a Supplementary Sum of £2,200 . .	37,900
7.	Privy Council Office .	6,120
9.	Mercantile Marine Services . . .	72,816
10.	Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade . . .	1,508
12.	Charity Commission .	15,892
13.	Civil Service Commission	23,750
15.	Friendly Societies Registry	5,624
16.	Local Government Board	147,782
17.	Lunacy Commission, England . . .	10,905
20.	Public Record Office .	14,190
21.	Public Works Loan Commission . . .	1,500
22.	Registrar-General's Office, England . .	25,994
23.	Stationery and Printing	418,053
24.	Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues, &c., Office	13,398
25.	Works and Public Buildings Office. . .	52,596
26	Secret Service . .	10,000
	Scotland.	
29.	Lunacy Commission .	3,799
30.	Registrar-General'sOffice	2,978
	Ireland.	
32.	Household of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland .	2,632
33.	Chief Secretary for Ireland . . .	17,756
35.	Charitable Donations and Bequests Office . .	1,051
37.	Public Record Office .	3,580
39.	Registrar-General'sOffice	7,332
40.	Valuation and Boundary Survey . . .	14,848
		£1,182,699"

Class III.

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,569,601, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class III. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

		£
1.	Law Charges . . .	42,774
2.	Miscellaneous Legal Expenses . . .	21,944
3.	Supreme Court of Judicature . . .	177,556
4.	Land Registry . .	22,813
5.	County Courts . .	3
6.	Police, England and Wales . . .	25,036
	Scotland.	
10.	Law Charges and Courts of Law . . .	50,706
11.	Register House, Edinburgh . . .	27,700
12.	Crofters' Commission .	2,545
13.	Prisons	53,650

Ireland.

	£
14. Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	37,872
15. Supreme Court of Judicature and other Legal Departments	59,086
16. Irish Land Commission	139,050
17. County Court Officers, etc.	66,298
19. Royal Irish Constabulary	721,499
20. Prisons	62,556
21. Reformatory and Industrial Schools	55,251
22. Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum	3,262
	£1,569,601 "

Class IV.

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £8,928,337, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Board of Education (including a Supplementary Sum of £200,000)	6,793,646
2. British Museum	111,041
3. National Gallery	7,233
4. National Portrait Gallery	2,897
5. Wallace Collection	3,454
6. Scientific Investigation, etc., United Kingdom	30,479
7. Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales	141,400
8. Public Education, Scotland (including a Supplementary Sum of £11,000)	1,183,554
9. National Galleries, Scotland	2,416
Ireland.	
10. Public Education	648,360
11. Endowed Schools Commissioners	510
12. National Gallery	1,147
13. Queen's Colleges	2,200
	£8,928,337"

Class V.

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,407,405, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Diplomatic and Consular Services	319,340
2. Colonial Services (including a Supplementary Sum of £132,690)	910,289
2A. Colonial Services (Jamaica Earthquake Relief, Grant in Aid)	150,000
3. Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable	26,776
4. Cyprus (Grant in Aid)	1,000
	£1,407,405 "

Class VI.

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £146,079, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz :—

	£
3. Hospitals and Charities, Ireland	139
4. Savings Banks' and Friendly Societies' Deficiencies	145,940
	£146,079 "

Class VII.

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £386,191, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure in respect of the Services included in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz. :—

	£
1. Temporary Commissions	36,000
2. Miscellaneous Expenses	46,151
3. Repayments to the Local Loans Fund	4,601
4. Ireland Development Grant	85,000

	£
5. Expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905	200,000
6. Repayments to Civil Contingencies Fund	14,439
	£386,191"

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £16,036,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Expenditure on the Navy Services, viz. :—

	£
3. Medical Establishments and Services	268,700
4. Martial Law	14,200
5. Educational Services	172,500
6. Scientific Services	65,100
7. Royal Naval Reserves	418,300
8. Section 2. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Matériel	3,035,200
8. Section 3. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.—Contract Work	7,646,000
9. Naval Armaments	2,348,700
11. Miscellaneous Effective Services	401,000
12. Admiralty Office	364,600
14. Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances	1,302,000
	£16,036,300"

ARMY ESTIMATES 1907-8.

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £9,758,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for expenditure on the Army Services, including Army (Ordnance Factories), viz. :—

	£
2. Medical Establishment, Pay, etc.	460,000
3. Militia, Pay, Bounty, etc.	840,000
4. Imperial Yeomanry, Pay and Allowances	410,000
5. Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances	1,152,000
6. Quartering, Transport, and Remounts	1,909,000
8. Ordnance Department, Establishments and General Stores	620,000
11. Establishments for Military Education	137,000
12. Miscellaneous Effective Services	67,000
13. War Office and Army Accounts Department	567,000
14. Half Pay, Retired Pay, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers	1,714,000
15. Pensions and other Non-Effective Charges for Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Men, and others	1,709,000
16. Civil Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances, and Gratuities	173,000
Ordnance Factories	100
	£9,758,100"

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

11. "That a sum not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

First Two Resolutions read a second time and postponed.

Third Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich) said he desired to bring under the notice of the House the action of the Government in regard to the Brussels Sugar Convention, and he hoped the House would have some explanation of the motives of the Government, and the advantages which they expected to accrue to the country. The course the Government had adopted seemed altogether incomprehensible. If the view of the Government were now precisely the same as the views of its members when they opposed the Convention no explanation would be necessary. They would be bound to denounce the Sugar Convention, and, indeed, it would have been their duty to give notice of their intention to do so immediately on assuming power. But the attitude of the Government was no longer the same. The ground on which the Convention was formerly opposed in debate was that it would inflict serious injury on the sugar-using industries of this country and impose an intolerable burden upon consumers. Since the Convention came into operation, however, our exports of confectionery had largely increased, and were now greater by far than they had ever been. As regarded the burden on the consumers the estimates of members of the Government varied considerably. The most ambitious of those estimates was that made by the President of the Board of Education, who said the Convention was going to impose on the consumers of this country a loss of £19,000,000 sterling. The lowest estimate was that made by the Prime Minister, who reduced the £19,000,000 to £8,000,000. Nearly all his colleagues followed him and adopted £8,000,000, except the President of the Board of Trade, who put the burden at £9,000,000. Four years had passed since the Convention came into operation, and so far from these prognostications having come true, the average price of sugar for those four years had been less than in the ten years preceding, the reduction being from 1s. to 2s. per cwt. Even taking the Prime Minister's figures, it meant that the consumers would have got the sugar almost for nothing, while on the higher estimates the consumers would not only have got it for nothing, but the producers would have paid them a cash bonus for making use of it. In face of the facts the Government could not use the arguments they used at the time of the Convention. There was no doubt whatever that they had changed their view. Now they said that they did not want to see bounties continued, and they gave away the whole case on which their opposition to the Convention was based. Every argument used by the opponents of the Convention had been falsified by the event. On the other hand the Government of the day which supported the Convention stated that, while it would not increase the price of sugar, it would benefit the whole Empire both directly and indirectly. That statement had been proved to the letter. The quantity of sugar produced in the Empire had increased, a large quantity of sugar machinery had been shipped to the West Indies, new capital had been placed there, and the sugar producers there had been brought into such a position that, if they were not interfered with, they could produce sugar much more on a competing basis, which was not possible while sugar bounties existed. Since the Convention, while the total quantity of sugar imported had remained very much the same, the quantity of raw sugar as compared with refined had largely increased. That increase had been from thirteen to fifteen million cwts., nearly 15 per cent., and it meant that the difference had been refined at home and given employment to workers without in any degree interfering with any other industry, such as confectionery, which was said to depend on the bounties. He believed it would be possible to maintain a great beetroot sugar industry in this country, which would have the great advantage of giving employment to the population remaining on the land. No one who had the smallest knowledge of the condition of affairs in France and Germany could fail to realise the enormous advantage of the beetroot sugar industry to those countries. It had the effect of improving the whole of their agricultural processes. Even in Germany, as there must be in almost every country, there was a tendency for the population to drift towards the towns. But in the United Kingdom this was enormously more so than was the case with Germany, because in that country their agriculture had advanced simultaneously with their manufacturing industries, whilst in this country we had deliberately sacrificed our agriculture to our manufactures. One of the greatest evils in this country was the way in which people were leaving the land and flocking to the towns; and anything which would stop this flow would be of great advantage to the country as a whole. The Government, in these latter days of the session, were endeavouring to force through the House two Land Bills—each of which was entirely different from the other, in order that there should be no mistake and that one should be right—the whole object of these Bills being to try and get the people back to the land.

The Bills entailed a very large expenditure of money. But in the establishment of a beetroot sugar industry they had an easy method of accomplishing this end. The maintenance of such an industry would have a two-fold advantage inasmuch as it would be partly industrial and partly agricultural. But the action of the present Government with regard to the Convention had endangered the possibility of such an industry being established in this country. Before the letter of the right. hon. Gentleman was written a body of gentlemen in this country had subscribed the capital to start beet growing and sugar producing on a large scale in this country. The moment that letter was written these gentlemen came to the conclusion that they must abandon the enterprise in the meantime. But there was another thing. The object of every one of the Continental Powers who joined the Convention was to have equality, not only in sugar but in sugar products. Whatever the effect of the right. hon. Gentleman's action, this, he thought, was inevitable—we were going to allow bounty-fed sugar to come in without restriction. Every one of the Continental countries who were parties to the Convention were bound by the spirit of the Convention to take steps to see that they did not suffer from the advantage we might gain by taking in bounty-fed sugar. The result would practically be that in some form or another additional duties would be placed upon our confectionery. It was difficult to see what the motive of the Government was. It might be said that the action of the Government would allow us to receive large supplies of sugar which by the Convention we were prevented from receiving now. That argument was possible to no one who had read the despatch of the Foreign Secretary. In that despatch the Foreign Secretary said to the British Minister at Brussels that he had to impress on the Foreign Powers that there would be no great harm in allowing us to continue in the Convention because the disadvantage of what we were doing could not be material to those contracting States. The disadvantage, whatever it was, was in precise proportion to the advantage we received. If there was no material disadvantage to those States, there was no material advantage to us; and, therefore, that could not possibly be an adequate motive for making this change in our existing system. The favourite theory of the Prime Minister and the President of the Board of Trade was that the Sugar Convention was a microcosm of fiscal policy as a whole. What did they say about the microcosm now? He did not think that the matter had anything to do with the fiscal question. On the contrary, he did not see how anything could be more in accordance with free trade than an attempt to change an unnatural into a natural source of supply. But every one knew the motive of the Government. Next to Chinese labour the sugar question was the subject of controversy at the election on which the greatest number of misrepresentations were made. The motive which had caused this despatch to be sent was precisely that which had been the governing motive of the Government in their South African policy. It had been to cover up as far as they possibly could the tracks made by their misrepresentations before the general election. The Foreign Secretary was one of the small band described by Lord Rosebery as certain to act as "watch-dogs" to prevent serious harm being done in the Cabinet. The watch-dogs had been very dumb dogs since the Government came into power. The right hon. Gentleman had tried to find a compromise which was absolutely useless. We could only be of use to the Convention as a consuming country, and, speaking for himself, he would much prefer to denounce it. The result would be precisely the same, but the only advantage of the right hon. Gentleman's course of action was that we continued to pay our share to the expenses of the Commission in Brussels without doing anything to assist the object for which the Convention had been created. But what the Government were doing in this matter was a sample of what they had done ever since they took up office. He might take by way of illustration the taxation of feu duties in Scotland. The Government had caused a fall in every kind of security and property in Scotland, not so much through what they had done as by what they threatened to do. The right hon. Gentleman and his Government also in regard to the sugar question had disturbed, or threatened to disturb, industries which were getting along extremely well, for no purpose whatever.

except to satisfy the Members behind them who had given pledges about these questions previous to the general election.

*DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford) congratulated the hon. Gentleman on the speech which he had just made, but thought it was hardly fair that sugar should be made the subject of discussion when there were so many other important questions exciting attention. He desired to draw attention to to the question of Egypt. He did not wish to go back to the discussion that took place recently, except for the purpose of expressing a hope that the time had arrived for the extension of clemency to the Denshawi prisoners, that they would be released, and the reproach to this country removed. Of the reforms awaiting solution in Egypt education was the first. He urged that the need of Egypt was a national University. At present she had elementary, technical and secondary schools, but no University to complete the educational ladder, and to lead and develop the intellectual life of the people. Without such a University, a satisfactory number of teachers in the lower schools could not be procured, nor sufficient men for the Civil Service and the learned professions. A committee of Egyptians started a fund for a University, and raised something like £30,000, when Lord Cromer pronounced the scheme premature and brought the effect to a standstill. He trusted Sir Eldon Gorst would approve of the proposal, and that the Government would not only give the University its blessing, but also provide money out of the Exchequer for its inauguration and upkeep. He hoped it would be carried through speedily. Speaking of education, he should like to see Arabic adopted more thoroughly and universally than it was, especially in the higher schools. It became an extremely difficult thing for the Egyptians to learn engineering, law, and medicine through the medium of foreign languages. It meant that they had to learn English and French and then had to study the subject afterwards. Although they were told there were not sufficient text books in Arabic, surely it was quite clear that text books could be rapidly supplied. One necessity of educational life was the provision of public libraries. At present, he was given to understand, there were only two public libraries in Egypt, the Khedivial library at Cairo, and one municipal library at Alexandria. He trusted the Government would try to supply more libraries for the enlightenment and advancement of the Egyptian people. Then he came to political reforms. Lord Dufferin said—

> "It is certain that local self-government is the fittest preparation and most convenient stepping-stone to anything approaching a constitutional *régime*."

To-day in Egypt there were only five municipalities so far as he could make out from the Blue-book. These municipalities, of course, had not reached a high state of development, but they were progressing, and he thought it would be to the advantage of the country if more municipal governments were created, and if the powers of those who had municipal government were extended. In reference to the provincial councils which were the creation of Lord Dufferin, and as to the managers of the municipalities, the Egyptians asked for the elimination of the nominative element, so that they might enjoy what we had in this country, full popular election. Beyond that, they wanted the interference of the English inspector to be reduced to a purely advisory position. At present he was an entirely domineering personality, and he certainly checked the councils, municipal and provincial, and practically dictated the policy that they had to carry out. The local councils of Egypt might make mistakes, but it would be absolutely impossible for them to make headway unless they had the opportunity of making those mistakes, just as we made mistakes in this country. It was only in that way that those councils could secure a brighter and happier future. He had mentioned that five towns had municipal government, but Cairo was still left out in the cold. Surely it was time that Cairo should have municipal government. Mr. Machell, adviser to the Minister of the Interior, said—

> "The streets in the towns where municipalities exist are well swept and watered; some of the principal thoroughfares are being macadamised; lighting is general, and progress is continually being made in the direction of gradually filling in and reclaiming the most important of the large pools in the immediate vicinity."

He ventured to say this state of things was in happy contrast to the conditions in towns without municipal management. Lord Cromer, in speaking about municipal government in 1904, said—

> "As time goes on, it will, without doubt, be possible to increase the Government grants; but a thorough solution of this question can only be passed eventually in a general system of local taxation. My personal opinion, however, is that the time has scarcely yet arrived for the adoption of such general system."

That was the unfortunate policy of Lord Cromer, which checked municipal development in Egypt, and it was to be sincerely hoped that Sir Eldon Gorst would reverse that policy and that municipal government would be distinctly and rapidly developed. As far as village councils were concerned, the time might not be ripe for them, but surely the time was ripe for the mayors and deputy-mayors to be appointed by the villagers. They were public officials, practically nominated by the Government. It would be better for the villagers if they had the appointments in their own hands, and it would be an encouragement to the development of self-government. To come to Parliamentary institutions: the Legislative Council and General Assembly were two institutions created by that wise and far-seeing statesman, Lord Dufferin. He started them in 1883, but most unfortunately they had not been kindly and happily dealt with by the Agent-General in Egypt. They had been treated more or less like the Duma; they had been despised and rejected, and they felt that it was now time this country brought its influence to bear in Egypt; it was time that we encouraged those institutions, and gave the Egyptians that for which they were asking, and for which they had practically formulated their plans, namely, Home Rule in reference to their own affairs. They who thought with him believed that it was Home Rule which had solved many difficulties and problems of the British Empire, and they believed that it would be the solution of the problem in Egypt. The Egyptians did not ask for any control over Europeans; they asked that they should have the right to legislate and to tax; he believed they had the right to tax, but they had no power to legislate. They did not want to legislate for Europeans; they simply wanted Home Rule in the interests of the Egyptians. Nor did they ask for any power over foreign affairs, which would be left entirely in the hands of the representatives of this country. Lord Cromer's reception of these aspirations again had been extremely unfortunate. Instead of encouraging them, he had practically told them that they were not fit. Lord Cromer had done even worse service than that, for he had actually proposed a counter-programme for the creation of an International Council, which was to consist of thirty-six members, of whom only ten at the outside would be representative of the Egyptians. It was Lord Milner who spoke of the curse of internationalism upon Egypt. He thought that this proposal would put the curse of internationalism effectually round the neck of the Egyptians, preventing their own national development. Lord Cromer went on to say—p. 7 of the Blue-book—that they were not fit. That was a very serious reflection on Lord Cromer's Government. Lord Cromer had been in Egypt for twenty-four years practically as dictator, with a free hand so far as this country was concerned, and with an opportunity to create self-government. It was a confession of failure. He knew what the argument was; it was the argument applied to Ireland and to many other countries of the world, that they were "not fit." What did they see taking place in the world? Persia was developing Parliamentary institutions, Japan was enjoying her Parliamentary institutions, and Bulgaria also was prospering under Parliamentary government. Surely it was time they gave the same to Egypt. The Egyptians never would be fit for self-government until they had the opportunity of showing their fitness. Mr. Gladstone truly said—

> "Liberty alone fits for liberty."

The Secretary for India wrote—

> "To treat native Ministers as mere ciphers and puppets, and then to hope to leave them at the end with authority enough to govern the country by themselves, is pure delusion."

They wanted the day when Egyptian ministers are treated as ciphers and puppets to pass away, and so enable the Egyptians to carve out to some extent their own destiny. Coming to imperial considerations, Egypt we were told was essential to England as the highway to India, and, further, we had great commercial interests there which were growing every day. In the pathology of Empire Egypt must be a drain on this country to some extent, to what extent he could not say, but she would be a drain in reference to the upkeep of the Army and the Navy. After all, Egypt was a source of weakness and danger to this country, laying us open to complications with other Powers, and certainly our occupation of Egypt had weakened our moral influence in Europe, as could be seen for instance in our relation towards the Macedonian problem. What should our policy be, then? He thought the policy was laid down not only by Mr. Gladstone, but also by Lord Salisbury. Lord Salisbury's policy was that we should declare Egypt a neutralised territory, and adopt the Munro doctrine, that any interference with Egypt by a foreign Power would be regarded by us as an unfriendly act, that we should continue to direct her foreign policy until she was fit to do that for herself; and that we should recognise, further, the eternal truth that no nation was capable of governing another nation satisfactorily. The Prime Minister had stated that good government was no substitute for self-government. Our contribution to civilisation all the world over had been along the path of liberty, and he trusted that we should give full liberty to Egypt as we had done to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony.

*MR. KING (Cheshire, Knutsford) said he had sat in that House for the greater part of two long sessions, and had not yet asked the indulgence of the House for so much time as would be required for the delivery of a single line of *Hansard.* He therefore appealed with some confidence for the patient and indulgent hearing invariably accorded to a new Member. He ventured to intervene in this debate for the purpose of calling attention to one subject, and one subject only—the Conference at the Hague. The subjects which were being discussed at that Conference were perhaps the most important that could engage the attention of statesmen at the present time. The proceedings of the Conference were being followed by thoughtful men and women, not only in this country but throughout the civilised world, with absorbing interest. Public opinion was rapidly awakening to the fact that war was a relic of barbarism and should find no place in the civilisation of the twentieth century. This happy development was being hastened by the realisation of the ever-increasing burden of armaments in time of peace—a burden which was not only a hindrance to peaceful industry and to all schemes of social reform, but was in some cases threatening the financial stability of States. The utterances of the Prime Minister and of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs during recent months had caused all eyes to be turned to the Hague, with hopes excited perhaps to an unjustifiable extent. For his own part he believed that whatever might be the immediate practical outcome of the present Conference these declarations would have done nothing but good. They had lifted the whole question of peace and war, of war against war, out of the somewhat limited environment of peace and arbitration societies into the wider arena of statesmanship and diplomacy. It was not a matter for surprise, in view of the accounts of what had occurred, or was reported to have occurred at the Hague, which had appeared in the Press of this country during the past week, that a feeling of disappointment and depression had followed close upon the heels of a period of hope and of elation. For his own part he did not entirely share that feeling. The Secretary of State knew what the reports were to which he alluded. Many of them he believed he would be able to say were unfounded, and his principal object in rising was to ask him to take this opportunity of making such a statement as he was able to reassure the public mind. The statements to which he alluded were well summed up in the following words from the special correspondent of the *Tribune,* which appeared on the 26th of July—

> "No delegate, European, Asiatic, or American, to whom I have spoken has been able to point to a single word or deed by the British delegation which has been of any help to those who were trying to promote arbitration or prevent war."

That was a very serious indictment, and if true, it was difficult to reconcile it with the public declarations of Ministers to which he had previously alluded. He appealed to the Secretary of State, if he could do so without endangering the progress of events which they were all so anxious to see brought to a successful conclusion, to make some statement which would enable them to judge of the value to be attached to such deplorable assertions. The same correspondent went on to say that Britain had abdicated all claim to its position as Leader of the League of Peace, and that that honourable post was now held by Germany. So long as the desired results were attained — so long as the League of Peace was a reality and not a sham—he cared little what nation in the eyes of the world got the credit for it. He was not sure, and as an Englishman he said it with regret and humiliation, that upon its past record Germany was not more deserving of the honour than this country. For over thirty years Germany had engaged in no serious war. He would that we could say the same. He was afraid that apart from our record our case had been weak on other grounds. Whilst on the one hand we have been putting forward proposals for securing a diminution of armaments, the Admiralty officials had been declaring that our Navy was stronger than ever, and the Secretary of State for War advocating the creation of a nation-in-arms and a striking force of 165,000 men. We had our delegates at The Hague—and he believed this would not be disputed —opposing proposals for the immunity of private property at sea. He knew he was regarded by many in this House and out of it as a crank on this subject. He admitted he was an enthusiast. He rejoiced in the progress which had been already made, but he looked forward to much greater progress in the future. He looked forward to the time when some future British Government would send delegates to a future Hague Conference, not as on the present occasion to urge a diminution of armaments as a matter of expedience, but to say that the Government had come to the conclusion that the whole business of war was wrong and unworthy of a Christian nation, that they had abolished their Army and Navy, or at any rate reduced them to the nature and proportions of a police force, that they intended in future to rely on the justice of their cause—and in case of dispute to invite other nations to settle the matter by friendly discussion, or failing that by arbitration. Such a proposal might seem Utopian and unprecedented. He did not think it was Utopian, and it certainly was not unprecedented even in the history of our own country. They heard a great deal nowadays about Empire and Empire - builders, about Colonies and great Colonials. There was one great Colonial statesman, perhaps the greatest in our time, whose name was now little heard, and whose achievements were, he was afraid, little remembered to-day—he referred to William Penn. In 1684 William Penn received from the King a grant of lands on which to found a Colony on the new Continent across the seas. There were two features in connection with that Colony which were, he thought, unique in Colonial history. In the first place, William Penn, although he had received a grant of land from the King, felt he had no right to take possession of it until he had made friendly arrangements with the aboriginal inhabitants of the soil. Accordingly, the first thing he did was to call together the chiefs of the tribes who resided on the land to tell them that he and his friends wished to come and live amongst them on friendly terms, and were willing to pay for the land they required. Further, as a guarantee of his friendly intentions, he assured them that the Colonists had brought no arms with them and intended to maintain no military force of any kind. For seventy years this Colony possessed no more formidable military equipment than a policeman's baton. During those seventy years not a single life was lost in any dispute between the white Colonists and the red men. At the end of that period when a generation had grown up which knew not Penn and a Militia was established, the Colony became involved in all the horrors of strife and bloodshed which had been characteristic of other Colonies on the American Continent. He (Mr. King) was afraid he had wandered somewhat from the subject of The Hague Conference; he apologised to the House if he had allowed his feelings to run away with his argument, and he concluded by thanking the House for its patient and courteous hearing, and by once more appealing to the Secretary of State to make that statement with reference to the proceedings at The Hague, to obtain which had been the main object of his intervening in the debate.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) congratulated the hon. Member for the Knutsford Division upon passing so successfully through the ordeal of his maiden speech. The question of the Congo was extremely critical at the present moment. When it was remembered that the position of England and other European nations, which in Africa governed millions of natives under systems different from that followed in the Congo, was endangered by the system now existing in the Congo, it was well to consider exactly how we stood regarding the sovereignty there, and how we and the United States and the other parties to the Berlin Act stood in relation to the present question. For seven years an agitation had gone on for the purpose of making the people of this country understand how the King of the Belgians had followed up the promises made when the independent State of the Congo was formed. The hon. Member for the Knutsford Division had referred to the work of William Penn as an interesting example of what could be done in dealing with a native people without recourse to arms. He admitted that the same thing could not be done in every case, for the North American Indians were a superior tribe. Another illustration that might be used in this connection was that of the Hudson's Bay Company. In that case commerce was carried on by the natural system of exchange and barter, and step by step the natives were brought to a higher form of living and to a system of order and discipline which had never been seriously interrupted.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): And by the influence of the Jesuits.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he agreed with his hon. friend that the Jesuits had exercised a beneficent influence in that region. But no missionary in the Congo had had sufficient influence to bring into effect the proper kind of government. The natives of the Congo were not governed in accordance with modern ideas of civilisation and order. Effect had not been given to the obligations laid down in the Berlin Act. The story of the formation and government of the Congo State had already been one of the most interesting, exciting, and humiliating in the history of Africa. It was announced in 1884 that the International Association of the Congo was—

> "Founded by the King of the Belgians for the purpose of promoting the civilisation and commerce of Africa, and for other humane and benevolent purposes."

The late Sir Henry Stanley explained from the platform to the people of this country that the native of the Congo was peace-loving, and that he desired to trade; he stated further that the object of the Congo State administration would be to give to the native a brighter and happier future. Mr. Kasson, the American Secretary of State, speaking of the Berlin Conference used these words—

> "The President regards this local government, or any successors resting on the same basis of principles, as an assurance that the natives will learn that civilisation and dominion of white men means for them peace and freedom, and the development of useful commerce free to all the world."

What was the position of the Congo trade at the present time? The Congo Government had done nothing to establish trade as we understood it. Every promise made by the King of the Belgians had been falsified by events. William Penn, in America, purchased land from the Indians, or gave them articles in exchange for the land. The natives were treated as owners of the soil and of the natural products of the soil. That was the opposite of the system pursued in the Congo to-day, and for that reason they had a right to complain. Nowhere else in Africa were native tribes treated as were the native tribes of the Congo. There they had the sovereign of the Congo State saying to the people: "This land is my land, the products of the soil are my products, you are my tenants, and it is your duty to bring to me the products of the soil which are my property." That was a montrous travesty of the rights of ownership. It was a monstrous travesty of every principle that had ever been pursued by a civilised Power in relation to native tribes. There was no European Power possessing authority in Africa to-day which pursued the same policy as Belgium did in the Congo. It was to the credit of Germany, France, and England that the rights of natives were respected in regard to land. [An HON. MEMBER: "No."] At any rate, his hon. friend would agree with him that the system of taxation was not taxation by labour. He had laid down what he believed to be two thoroughly sound principles, namely, that the natives primarily owned the land and the products of the soil, and that when the land was acquired by white men for the purpose of civilisation a due return should be given to the natives. In the case of Uganda, Sir Harry Johnston stated that the land was bought from the natives, a certain amount of reserve land remaining in their own possession for their own purposes. Wherever Germany, France, or England had dependencies or protectorates in West and East Africa, a poll tax was levied varying in amount from 2½d. up to 15s. a year. In the Congo the system of taxation did not give the native the smallest stimulus to work in order to pay his tribute to the State. The taxation was by labour. Sixty days a year was the legal number of days upon which the native was compelled to work, but it had been proved up to the hilt that the number went up to 300. At the end of the year therefore the native had nothing to show for his labour, and he was as destitute as when he began. The position of the native in the Congo to-day was a disgrace to civilisation. The atrocities which had been committed had been proved up to the hilt. A report published in the newspapers within the last few days went to show that the people of a whole village were sent out at the point of the bayonet to collect rubber. After working a fortnight, a month, or two months, they were compelled to bring the products of their gathering to the State officer, and they received nothing in return; they had only done their duty to the State. The position was impossible; remembering the effect the present policy in the Congo might have on the future of Africa, he thought our Government would only be doing their duty if they pressed upon the Belgian people, and upon the nations of Europe which were parties to the Berlin Act, that there ought to be a reform of the present system, which was absolutely antagonistic to all the elements of humanity. The British Note of 1903 had clearly laid down the policy which he had tried to put before the House. The Congo State was under international engagements with respect to the administration which entitled those who deplored the present state of things to ask that the Congo State should live up to its obligations. In another place the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs and the Leader of the Opposition in that House had used some very careful language concerning the present position. Annexation was looming in the distance by the Belgian people and Government. Everybody would have the question settled in that way, but it must be on one condition only—that the present system should be absolutely reformed. If the two things which he had tried to lay down were not carried out, and the present system of taxation were continued, then the annexation of the Congo to Belgium would only be another crime added to a crime against humanity. He did not think that the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs spoke as strongly as he might have done, though he presented the case very carefully. Lord Lansdowne also spoke with great reserve, though fairly. At the same time there was a suggestion that those who desired the reform of the Congo wanted more drastic measures than himself. He did not think that a gunboat was necessary on the Congo. A gunboat would not produce any desired effect. That was an attitude that might be taken by the Foreign Secretary, who had a large share of responsibility, but he hoped that this Government would not recognise any scheme of annexation which would perpetuate the present system of administration in the Congo, which was a disgrace to civilisation. His belief was that the Government would have the country behind them if they said to the Belgian people that the present system must no longer be maintained. The Belgian people had not experience of that kind of colonisation which Great Britain had, and would undoubtedly like, in taking over the government of the Congo, to be practically relieved of the whole expenses of government and administration which were at present paid by the natives; while £7,000,000 had also gone out of the country in dividends and profits which were the result of the labour of the natives. He ventured to say that there was not another country in the world inhabited by natives where such a result could possibly be produced by means of an army of 30,000 men armed with breech-loading rifles. That Army forced the natives into the forests to gather rubber. The country was an armed camp, and, as one man had said, there was a soldier behind every producer. He defied any man to point to a single country in the world where the native races were being developed into a state of civilisation which could show such a state of affairs. It would be impossible otherwise, in any other part of Africa, to produce the profits that had been wrung from the people by the present system of government in the Congo. Every nation had found, in establishing rule over native races and encouraging their development, either in Colonies or Protectorates, that it had been a very expensive process. They had generally been run at a loss for many years. If the Belgian people were not willing to accept a scheme of annexation which would involve the introduction of reforms in taxation and in the development of the trade and commerce of the country, he believed it to be the duty of this Government absolutely to refuse to recognise any other scheme of annexation. This country had often expressed itself in extravagant terms concerning the bad government of such places as Bulgaria, but he did not think it was possible to express themselves in terms too extravagant in regard to the Congo. He believed that the issue was so great that this nation, apart from its responsibilities under the Berlin Act, was bound to take up a position which would justify the civilised world in rising to a sense of responsibility for the future of the whole continent of Africa. There were 20,000,000 people in the Congo, and it was said that during the last twenty-six years 3,000,000 had disappeared. The latest testimony had come from Mr. Harding Davies, who lately visited the Congo. Mr. Harding Davies was an American author and journalist who had travelled much and seen much, and his testimony the House could not afford to disregard. In 1906 King Leopold replied to a protest which had been made against Congo administration, saying to the nations of the world, "Hands off." Under the existing system, he was afraid, in the present temper of the Belgian Parliament and of the Belgian Sovereign, that nothing would be done by way of reform unless it was clearly shown that they meant to see that the obligations entered into by the Berlin Act were fulfilled. They could be fulfilled if the most ordinary rules of the rights of proprietorship were maintained in the Congo State. Unless that was done and the natives secured against outrages by the soldiers, unless there was taken from them the kind of taxation over which there could be no proper control, because it was taxation by labour, the consequences not only to the native races of the Congo but to many millions of the native races throughout other spheres of influence might be of the most serious kind, and disaster might overtake civilisation in Africa from which the continent would not recover for generations. He hoped that the Foreign Secretary that day would give an assurance to the House that between now and the autumn, when the Bill for the annexation scheme was to be laid before the Belgian Parliament, the forces and influence of the Government would be sympathetically used—knowing the strength of feeling of the British people—so as to produce the effect desired by every lover of humanity and every friend of civilisation.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucester, Forest of Dean) said that the first four speakers in the debate had dealt with entirely different subjects. The second speaker had raised for the first time in the present Parliament a question which was raised every year in previous Parliaments. The hon. Gentleman did not discuss the present condition of Egypt under British occupation so much as why there was an occupation of Egypt at all. He would like to call the attention of the hon. Gentleman and of those who would follow him to the fact that they could not disregard what occurred when Mr. Gladstone was in power in 1893. Mr. Gladstone stated very fully to the House exactly what had occurred. He pointed out that no one could be more anxious than he was, from the time of the occupation of Egypt, to bring that occupation to a term, but that it was impossible for the reasons which he gave; that the last chance had been given in 1893 in connection with the refusal of his (Mr. Gladstone's) offer of an improved Drummond-Wolff Convention. The Sultan of Turkey and every nation except France had agreed to the Drummond-Wolff Convention, but finally the Sultan, through the influence of the French Government, had refused to sanction it. Mr. Gladstone in 1894 stated that immediately after he came into office he had sounded the Government of France with a view to see whether by any modification of the Drummond-Wolff Convention agreement could be reached. The assent of France, however, could not be obtained, and French opinion at that time was quite unwilling to accept the proposal. Mr. Gladstone afterwards said that whatever attention ought to be given to the improvement of the government of Egypt, the British occupation would have to continue indefinitely. His hon. friend had connected with this subject that of Macedonia, expressing the view that our position in Egypt had weakened our hands in dealing with Macedonia. He did not differ from his hon. friend in the belief that our hands were weakened for many purposes by the Egyptian occupation. In Macedonia now for many years we had followed the policy of acting with the Powers, and especially with Austria. In view of the delicacy of the relations of the Eastern Churches, which were even more important than those of the different races in that part of Europe, we were bound to act very tenderly and gently in all questions where Austria considered her interests closely involved. We had taken an honourable part in connection with the difficulties which had arisen. We had consented to restrictions hampering our own trade, we had shown every evidence of our desire to take a leading part in restoring and keeping order and in giving liberty in Macedonia. The original conflict had widened and deepened, and other races had been involved, but he doubted whether the House could interfere with the main line of policy, which, however much old traditions might cause them to dislike it, was an Austrian policy and must continue to be an Austrian policy. He was sorry his hon. friend the Member for Gravesend mentioned Bulgaria as a country in regard to which this country had been unduly excited in the past. There was now no doubt that the atrocities did take place, and the Report of the authorities who visited the country shortly afterwards absolutely bore out the statements that were made at the time. The hon. Member for the Knutsford division of Cheshire in his admirable maiden speech, which they all welcomed as showing an increase of their debating power although they might sharply differ from him, made a slight attack upon the Government upon a ground upon which he did not think that many would share his views. The hon. Member had suggested that it might have been better to follow Germany in connection with peace and disarmament. He would not have been surprised if it had been suggested that we should follow the views of Germany on certain branches of the conduct of war, but he did not see how Germany could be claimed as having been a friend to the peace proposals of the Prime Minister, because it was notorious that it was the opposition of Germany which prevented those proposals being brought to an issue. It therefore seemed to him that the attack failed. He congratulated his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs upon the extraordinary power which he had shown of doing what Mr. Gladstone thought impossible—namely, carrying out the affairs of the Foreign Office in the House of Commons. It was generally thought that we stood at a disadvantage compared with other Powers because we made everything public whilst other Powers carried on their policy in secret. The reserve of the House of Commons since the present Government came into office had been most extraordinary. Our main proposal at The Hague Conference had never been debated in the House of Commons. He admired his right hon. friend for the extraordinary power he had displayed of carrying on at a most anxious period the work of the Foreign Office in the House of Commons and upon the extraordinary authority and success which had attended him in that work. The one and only risk that attended these weighty deliberations at The Hague was not the risk caused by publicity, but the risk caused by secrecy, which meant partial publicity. The Press went beyond the facts. Because we were especially friendly with France or some other Power and voted one way and Germany and the United States happened to vote another way the newspapers came to the ridiculous conclusion that there was some sort of grouping of the Powers in alliance, and that these measures, intended to make war more humane, were taken in view of some possible future war in which the Powers would be grouped. Though not an optimist about the state of Europe, he did not think there was a single Power contemplating war at the present time or making preparation at The Hague to carry on war. That House certainly was not expecting war nor preparing for war. We had more grounds of community with the United States than of difference. If the two countries differed on certain proposals that difference of detail had no such meaning as some organs in the Press unfortunately supposed. The only other word he would say upon the general questions discussed was as to the reassuring nature, in connection with our European alliances, of the last two statements made by the right hon. Gentleman as to the bearing of the proposed understanding with Russia. The question was one on which his right hon. friend had had a consistent policy long before the formation of the present Government. He was sure the desire for an understanding with Russia would be helped rather than damaged by the extreme caution which the Foreign Secretary had shown in his replies to questions in the House, wherein he had limited negotiations to matters connected with Central Asia and the Persian frontiers. That would conduce to peace, and, as his right hon. friend had shown, the present and future of Russia were too dark to allow us to be suspected, even by the most reckless newspapers, of taking sides with the Russian Government. The question was whether if that agreement was made it would be laid before Parliament, and he noticed that the Under-Secretary, in reply to the hon. Member for Leicester, stated that—

> "If any agreement is made with the Russian Government its terms will be laid before Parliament. My right hon. friend can only repeat the answer given to the hon. Member on 13th June, in which he said that—'The direct object of the negotiations is to prevent conflict and difficulties between the two Powers in the part of Asia which affects the Indian frontier and the Russian frontiers in that region. If the negotiations result in an agreement it will deal only with these questions.' 'The internal affairs of another country cannot,' the Under-Secretary added, 'be brought into negotiations of this kind.'"

The hon. Gentleman then went on to say as to the analogy of the Anglo-French Agreement that the developments in that case were the result of good feeling and public opinion. Turning last to the subject which the hon. Member for Gravesend had brought before the House, he shared with him some slight regret that the tone of the speeches in the House of Lords had not been so clear as the Government case was as stated by his right hon. friend the Secretary of State, who no doubt occupied the same position and would tell them the same as he had said before. The debate in the House of Lords was most satisfactory, however, in regard to some of the speeches which were made, notably the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury—one of the finest he had ever heard on the subject—and the speech of a Roman Catholic Peer, Lord Clifford of Chudleigh, who also appealed to the Government. The debate showed an admission of their case, that there was a universal concurrence of opinion in this country that the system of government was at the base of the whole of the horrors, and that it was useless to deal with the horrors unless the whole system of government was revolutionised in the Congo State. Lord Fitzmaurice and Lord Lansdowne, as well as Lord Clifford, declared that we were entitled to interfere. He believed the great mass of the House felt that we not only had a right, but were bound to interfere. There was, although this matter concerned the whole of Europe, a special moral obligation resting upon us in conjunction with the United States. This country and the United States were the two Powers that created the Congo

State, all the rest of Europe rather concurring in the details. Our right to interfere was clearly admitted by Stanley, who expressly stated what was now being denied, that it was by the Berlin Act that the Congo Free State came into being with King Leopold as sovereign. After stating that the enterprise was purely humanitarian and benevolent, he said that if any Power had the right to interfere, England was fairly entitled to. Those were Stanley's words in advance.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.) asked if we had any greater right to interfere than in the Colony of Natal to prevent a massacre of the natives.

SIR CHARLES DILKE said he was absolutely impartial as between our own State and other States, and he held that we had a right to interfere in the Natal case. Belgium, he proceeded, could only take over the Congo State subject to all the liabilities of the Berlin Act. Caution was always natural in the case of our Foreign Office, though it might be carried sometimes so far as to cause increased trouble later on. If anyone thought that any Power or Powers were watching this controversy with hostile intent, for political reasons—not commercial—he answered that there was no risk of war. If they removed causes of friction in all parts of the world between ourselves and any of those Powers, there was no reason why the Congo State question should be dangerous to us in a higher degree than there was danger in a hundred different instances. He was convinced that there was no ground for any terrors of that kind. The native in the Congo State should, as the Archbishop said and as he understood his right hon. friend accepted, have the right to buy and sell freely. He should not be forced by horrid cruelty to give either the King or any *concessionnaire* company the whole of his labour or of what he earned. It was useless to discuss a particular outrage; they must go to the root of the matter and remove the whole system which prevailed in the Congo. His hon. friend had said that the taking over of the Congo State with our assent, and we hoped with the assent of the other Powers, must be subject to an alteration of that system which lay at the whole basis of the present state of government in the Congo. He thought it very much better that the Belgians should be told plainly what we thought. There was an opposition in the Belgian Chamber to the taking over of the Congo State. Many there were afraid of the undefined liabilities of all kinds that might arise; but they were a minority, and we had better put the question plainly to Belgium. It was not on the minority that we wished to act. It was to be assumed that there was a majority with different views in the Belgian Parliament, in favour of taking over the Congo; and it was better they should know beforehand that this country could not assent to the continuance of the present system of government, which had been described by the Archbishop. Lord Fitzmaurice, in concluding a speech the other day, had examined various suggestions made some time ago as to consular jurisdiction and a Navigation Commission on the river, but the time had passed for all these suggestions and for taking comparatively unimportant steps which, if taken, would only bring about a European Conference, and they could always do that in many different ways. He hoped that in any representations which were made to Belgium with regard to her annexation of the Congo State his right hon. friend would continue to hold the language which he had on two or three previous occasions used, and would state that not only was it necessary to change the system described, but that we could not continue to recognise indefinitely the present state of things. A new defence had been issued that morning in a document from the Cabinet of the Congo State to the King of the Belgians, or, as he wished to put it, by King Leopold to himself. In that document it was said that we always discussed the Congo in ignorance of the facts. But that was not so, because all those public men who were interested in the question had from first to last followed the facts connected with the Congo with the closest attention. It was now many years since he (Sir Charles Dilke) had first brought Congo misrule before the House, and shortly afterwards a Swedish missionary had described what took place in the Congo State. Everything was denied at the time that was now admitted; every charge made in those days was proved. But they said in this document—

> "That the *régime* which is called inhuman is in reality very fair, since it only demands from the natives what they are able to pay, as the case may be."

What they were able to pay meant that these miserable savages were used and were allowed to die in the way in which some inhuman companies worked their omnibus horses, simply working them till they died, because it was cheaper to deal with them in that way. That was the system of labour tax—the rubber tax. Then in this document they went on to discuss what became of the money which arose out of the domain of the Crown, this being in reply to a memorable book which showed what did become of the money. The document said—

> "We feel compelled, however painful it may be, to tell the King that he is accused of enriching himself out of the blood of the natives."

They could leave out "blood" as much as they liked; it was not necessary for their case, which, evidently, it was known existed. But the King had taken the whole of the revenues into his own hands, and had the power of enriching himself by this extraordinary system, in breach of his treaty engagements. The Cabinet of the Congo State said in general terms that King Leopold had used—they did not say "the money"—some of the money that had come from the Congo State for great public objects in Belgium; he had endowed Belgium with all sorts of magnificent institutions at the cost of the Congo. His hon. friend had said that this situation was unique, but he would remember the attacks in "Max Havelaar" on the Dutch Government as to a situation which was not altogether without parallel, in regard to the earlier relations between Holland and Java. "Max Havelaar" called attention to abuses, though it was contended on the other side that they did not exist. It was not a system, however, like that on the Congo, which necessarily left the native destitute. The system in those days was to take out of Java far more than the whole of what was necessary for governing the rest of the Archipelago. That one island made for Holland something liked £9,000,000 net profit, and also had borne nearly the whole of the cost of governing the Archipelago. Holland had given up the system. He dismissed all these statements about what King Leopold had done in Belgium, and about whether a museum or some other institution which he had established was or was not of benefit to Belgium. There were other circumstances behind which largely altered the case. It was no answer to the case advanced both here and in Belgium to put forth statements of this kind in defence. Any candid Belgian—and candid, Belgians were numerous now—had only to read the facts and he would admit that the system of government in the Congo State was a violation of the Act. The plenipotentiaries, as they were called to whom the future of the State had been referred, consisted of three nominated by the Belgian Cabinet and three by the Congo Government, and these plenipotentiaries were picked mostly, he was afraid, because they were advocates of the present system of government in the Congo State. It was unfortunately the fact that the Belgian Chamber was not being informed at this moment by those who had an open mind on the Congo system of administration. In view of that fact, he could not but think that, whatever might be the grounds in this country for caution through fear of raising a dangerous question, we had better take our courage in both hands, and state clearly how we thought that the Belgians were misled. We should point out directly, he should say officially, that we meant what we said, and, while not accepting the Congo State for ourselves, we did intend that whoever took it over from the King should take it over subject to the treaties and Act of Berlin.

MR. McKEAN (Monaghan, S.) said that all the other Powers signatory to the Berlin Act had an equal call to interfere in the Congo; but not one of them would join this country, though they had been approached over and over again. The only country that signified its willingness to take common action was Turkey—a *reductio ad absurdum* of this spurious humanitarism. Who were the witnesses and what was the evidence against the existing *régime* in the Congo? No Member of the House who took the side on which the right hon. Gentleman had just spoken had been to the Congo. None of them, therefore, could profess to have first-hand knowledge on the subject. In this connection he, for one, would never make the tremendous indictment they formulated against King Leopold's rule in the Congo without having been there and seen evidences of the truth of the accusations with his own eyes. Hon. Gentlemen were the accusers. The *onus probandi*, therefore, was on them. They must accept the responsibility. The indictment they formulated was a tremendous one. It was not only that they impeached the ruler of the Congo, but they put on trial his officials—men who were trying to earn their living beneath the burning skies and amid the deadly climate of Central Africa. In the absence of personal knowledge, who were the witnesses on whose evidence those who attacked the present administration of the Congo relied? They were the members of the Congo Reform Association. Who were the members of that association? The originators of it and the promoters of it were certain Liverpool merchants. Up to a certain date those gentlemen did a huge trade in alcohol with the unfortunate natives of the Congo. During those halcyon days no talk was heard of mutilations and atrocities. For all one heard to the contrary, the Congo administration in those days was the nearest approach in the world to the ideal government. However, in an unfortunate moment for the reputation of his rule in the Congo, if a fortunate one for the poor negroes who were natives of that State, King Leopold introduced new rules with regard to the conditions of trade in the Congo—rules which had the effect of virtually prohibiting the trade in alcohol, and rules which made trading by the missionaries practically impossible. Suddenly, and almost simultaneously, it was discovered that the Congo was only another name for a certain unmentionable place in the next world. The most horrible tales of mutilations and other cruelties were proclaimed to the world. Then the Congo Reform Association was founded and it had carried on the propaganda of painting the Congo black with an energy and perseverance worthy of a much better cause. Mr. John Holt, of Liverpool, an alcohol merchant, had chiefly financed the Congo Reform Association. Now a few words as to the missionaries. He had no desire in the world to question their good faith. Quite the contrary. But they forced them to put their credibility to the test. Would they stand the test? His personal experience was that they would not. His experience, part of which he gave to the Committee last year, was that they hopelessly collapsed under the test. They talked at large about the atrocities, but they took good care to avoid specific details. Having heard one of them at a meeting last year tell stories that would make them think the Congo was reeking with atrocities, having listened to him for a good while, he requested him to be so good as to give particulars as to the names of the mutilated parties, the names of the perpetrators of these dastardly acts, the places where the alleged atrocities occurred, and the dates of their occurrence. He fenced with the question, evaded it, promised he would give all these important particulars, but till this day had never done so. He repeated exactly the same performance at another meeting he was present at; and even within the last few weeks in a newspaper controversy with himself he had pursued the same policy. But he got out of—or tried to get out of—the difficulty by saying that they denounced the atrocities before the Commission. This was what was said by Mr. James Pirie, an agent of a powerful and influential English company—the same company as Mr. George Grey, brother of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, was manager of, namely, Tanganika Concessions, Limited:

> "To stamp a man, and that man a missionary, as 'liar' and his utterances 'lies' is rather strong language to use, is not it? I am using these words to you only . . . but really I feel that I can use no other towards them. . . .
>
> "It makes me mad to think of the unholy lies sent home by these missionaries. Of course, they have a public at home who are only too anxious to believe every word they say. This public *wants* to believe them.
>
> 'It is possible they may be subsidised by some of the powerful financial people at home who are looking out with envious eyes on the enormous wealth of this State, but whatever the reason it is a most unrighteous thing to do."

One concluding word on this topic. He had some extracts from the diary of a Belgian traveller in the Congo,

Mr. McKean.

who recorded his experiences day by day, and the impression they left on the mind of the reader was that the Protestant missionaries were doing everything they could to unsettle the minds of the Congolese and to incite them to revolt. This was what this traveller wrote:—

> "I have never heard of a missionary attending to a sick person. They always send such persons to the judge at Baringa, stating that they are not here for the purpose of taking care of the sick. Several natives, on being questioned, declare that the missionaries never preach to them, but only ask them not to work for the State, or invite them to make complaints as to how they are treated by the State. . . . And this is what I learn from their own mouths: 'The missionaries came here, and said no prayers. They never spoke about God."

The missionary he heard at the meeting he attended, who was the great protagonist of this cause, never once mentioned the name of God from the beginning to the end of his speech. Let them test the credibility of some of the other witnesses against the Congo. The Belgian traveller, in his diary, further stated—

> "In front of the village the warriors await me under arms, and cry out defiances. The English have told them that an end has been put to work, and that they are not to supply the State."

The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean was the great protagonist of the so-called Congo Reform Party in this House. Let them see how far he was to be relied on in his statements. He would take some of his more recent statements later, but would go back first to one serious charge he made against the Congo Government in this House in 1897. He said—

> "Gin is the principal article of import into the Congo State,"

and in characteristically forcible language he described how the unfortunate negroes were being debauched by the wicked Belgians, and how the race was moving on towards its complete extinction through the introduction of spirits into Central Africa. There was no foundation, in fact, for the charge made by the right hon. Gentleman. Of all the Powers in Central Africa, not one had taken such vigorous measures as the Congo State against the introduction of gin or any alcoholic spirit into its territory. Then in his speech on the occasion of the Foreign Office Vote last year the right hon. Gentleman made two or three charges against himself, none of which had the least truth, all of which he publicly contradicted, and none of which the right hon. Gentleman either apologised for or withdrew. He would take the case of another witness against the Congo—a Consular officer whose Report had been much relied on by the critics of the Congo administration. He referred to Mr. Casement, and to his Report which was presented to this House in 1904. This gentleman made a somewhat hurried expedition to a restricted part of the Congo State; he had not the leisure to investigate very closely the stories he received from different parts. But he did find time to investigate in a quasi-judicial manner one particular case of mutilation. This was with reference to the loss of his hand by a negro boy named Epondo. As the result of his examination, he found the—

> "accusation proved on the spot without seemingly a shadow of doubt existing sa to the guilt of the accused sentry."

His case had been reproduced *ad infinitum* in the pamphlets and other productions of the Congo Reform Association. What were the facts? They were now well known and placed beyond dispute. The boy had lost his hand not by the cruel act of a sentry, but from injuries inflicted on him by a wild boar while hunting with his master. A surgical examination of the limb proved this; and the Rev. Mr. Weeks, who was no friend of the Congo State, verified the statement during a personal visit to Epondo's own native village. He had now given the Committee two cases in which the grave charges made with absolute confidence and great vehemence against the Congo State had been disproved. Was it not just possible that with regard to many of the other charges made against the Congo some similar refutation might be forthcoming? Speaking last year on the same subject, he quoted Mr. George Grey, who knew thoroughly well the southern part of the State, having lived there for many years; and the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs declared that his brother had only praise for the administration in that part of the colony;

but the right hon. Gentleman said that these remarks applied to only one district. Since last year the testimony of other English travellers of distinction who had visited the State had been obtained, and what did they say? Dr. Wolleston, a member of the British Museum Expedition to the Ruenzeri Mountains, crossed the Congo State from end to end, from the Eastern frontier to the Atlantic, and here was what he said—

> "I found the colony well organised considering how short a time it has existed. I have not the slightest grievance to set forth in this respect. On the contrary, I can but say that I was wholly satisfied with everything I saw. I authorise you to publish this statement if you think fit."

Major Powell Cotton, having visited the north-eastern part of the State around Lake Albert and the Nile, said—

> "All the officials I have seen are most zealous and conscientious men imbued with the importance of their work. And this eulogy is also applicable to the State. I will not go so far as to assert that isolated abuses are not committed and that there are not here and there defects. But I query—what colony or even what country is free from defects? But everything that it is possible to do in the interest of the natives is done. I noticed in particular the progress achieved in the Lado Enclave since my last visit; where there used to be nothing but temporary wood huts I found stations with brick-built houses, perfectly well kept. In every part I visited I found that improvement was the order of the day. And the famous atrocities? I have never met with anything that could be called an atrocity."

[A laugh.] That statement of Major Powell Cotton was met with a laugh by the hon. Member for Gravesend. That showed what manner of man he was. Let the House consider for a moment what the hon. Member was laughing at. He was quoting the words of an officer in the British Army; he himself had not manufactured the statement, and yet the hon. Member who jeered had assailed men and, so far as he could, robbed them of their characters without evidence. He thanked the hon. Member for the laugh, which he regarded as a valuable revelation of the frame of mind in which certain people approached the discussion of this subject. Major Powell Cotton further said—

> "I must tell you that I was in a better position than anyone to be acquainted with any abuses that might have been committed during my stay. I speak kiswahli and can converse with the natives; I paid my own expenses, and depended on no one for my escort since I had been authorised to travel with the escort I had engaged in Uganda. I travelled with this escort inland, often camping at four or five days march from any station. The natives were all the more inclined to communicate with me as they knew I was an Englishman. They never denounced a serious misdeed. They sometimes came and complained that a soldier had, for instance, stolen a fowl; and when I had the opportunity of pointing the fact out to the authorities, the offender was severely punished."

Another traveller, famous for his explorations in Central Asia, and whose name was well-known, Mr. Savage Landor, visited the north of the State, and here was an extract from a lecture he gave at the Royal Institution on 31st May last—

> "I will not enter the controversy regarding the administration of the Congo Free State. Maybe, my words, as I have been there, may not carry the weight of those writers who know nothing of that country. All I can say of the Belgian Congo is that the country is kept in excellent order; that the natives are quite happy and well-cared for; and the country far from being damaged is greatly improved by the construction of roads, by enormous plantations of rice, millet, indian corn, etc., which the natives prefer to receive in payment for the rubber instead of money which is useless to them. Many of the statements popular in this country are grossly exaggerated, if not unfounded altogether. But, of course, I am not a politician and I can only tell people what I see."

He supposed that the hon. Members who laughed were the men who maligned people. Let him ask why it was that some hon. Members who laughed, all of whom were men of pleasure, and many of whom were men of wealth, did not go to the Congo and see the state of things for themselves. [An HON MEMBER: Send Parker.] He would conclude this topic with some extracts from the interesting book by Lord Mountmorres that had been published within the past six months. Lord Mountmorres left England on 24th June, 1904, as special correspondent of the *Globe* newspaper, "to inquire into the alleged maladministration of the Congo Independent State. He returned to England on 19th February, 1905. In that book Lord Mountmorres said—

> "Those who by this system are shut out from a participation in the wealth of these splendid territories, although they may have good grounds for complaining at their exclusion, are not justified in maintaining that the organisation which has the monopoly of this wealth, has been guilty of inhumanity

or neglect of the interests of the natives in developing its resources. Whether the system itself is or is not in conformity with the intentions of the signatories to the Berlin Treaty, is not for me to discuss, but under that system —whether it be in conformity, or at variance, with those intentions—I can from my own experience state definitely that the administration in those parts which I visited is well and humanely carried out."

Again, as to atrocities Lord Mountmorres said—

"In all these regions of the directly governed parts of the State which I visited, I could hear no breath or rumour of anything approaching what are known as atrocities or abuses of their power on the part of the officials. The native is, as a rule, only too ready to adopt any suggestion conveyed to him by a question, more particularly when the suggestion is to the effect that he is ill-treated or suffering under any hardship. From the nature of the thing, I was continually obliged to cast my questions in such forms as would imply that I believed that abuses existed. Yet the only complaints that were ever made to me were of the most trivial description. One chief, after quite a lengthy cogitation, began a long story to which I eagerly attended, as I thought it must be going to lead up to some startling revelation; when at length he reached the climax of his grievances, it was that a flag which had been given to him by a white man some years ago was so badly torn by its constant use that the chief could no longer fly it, and he was much aggrieved that he had not received another. And this incident fairly represents the average gravity of the complaints that were made to me. The majority of them were related to domestic affairs and had no bearing whatever on the rule of the white man, and it was evident that in those parts where the State official was the only white man they knew, the idea of his presence being a hardship or of his treating them with cruelty had never entered their heads.."

And here was the explanation of the matter—

"The directly-governed parts which I traversed I found to be well and humanely governed the natives for the most part contented, and everywhere fairly treated, and the advance of civilisation proceeding at a speed and with an energy without a parallel in other parts of tropical Africa. When one takes into consideration the unique difficulties that had to be contended with from the outset in opening up this great equatorial forest, locked away from the coast and the outside world by natural barriers, and peopled by untamed cannibals, one is bound to admit that even the astounding development of French West Africa must rank second to what has been achieved by the devoted band of pioneers who, sprung from a race with no colonial experience, have built up a great self-supporting state in the heart of tropical Africa. To realise what has been achieved in the short space of less than a quarter of a century, it is only necessary to compare the conditions prevailing on the Ubangi—1,500 to 2,000 miles inland—with the best that has been achieved in centuries in the British colonies on the West Coast; to recall the fact that to-day the white man is safe, is welcome in the far-off interior of this vast dominion, whilst after 200 years and more of white occupancy along the West Coast he is still often liable to native ferocity a few hundred miles from the sea in British Colonies and, finally, to remember that the military force necessary to ensure this state of affairs is only one man per fifty square miles, lower than in the British Colonies."

So much for the North of the State. And what about the Reports of the Consuls, as published in the White Book Africa, No. 1, 1907? At page 1 of the Report of Vice-Consul Mitchell, who is stationed at Stanleyville, he read—

"The political conditions of the district are reported to be entirely satisfactory and no complaints have reached me from any quarter."

Again, at page 2 he writes—

"The villages are increasing in which signs of advancement are very evident. They are clean, well-kept, and surrounded by plantations. The inhabitants are decently clothed and seem happy."

After a tour of exploration in the Aruwimi district he wrote, at page 28—

"As the result of my journey, I found that in the district I passed through, the natives are quiet and contented."

Visiting the railway he reported, at page 29, that—

"The workmen look smart and cheerful and that all along the route new villages of natives from the inner forests have been established and trade freely with the Belgians."

How did hon. Gentlemen reconcile this statement with the alleged cruelty of the latter to the natives? The hon. Member for Gravesend said that atrocities had been proved up to the hilt; the British Consuls said there were none.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that in the White Paper it was stated that the natives had to give 304 continuous days of labour for the collection of rubber.

MR. McKEAN said he was dealing with atrocities and not with rubber. The hon. Gentleman said characteristically that the collection of rubber was an atrocity. He maintained that after that day the hon. Gentleman was a discredited witness; and if he was not, then he did not know what was the meaning of discredit. Vice-Consul Mitchell, in a Report, dated 18th September of last year wrote, at page 49 of the White Book—

> "Atrocities do not exist in this province."

He had always said that the state of things was not perfect, but that the difficulties of the situation were immense. That being so, it was impossible to do what the hon. Member for Gravesend said could be done. It was a great pity that the English nation did not realise what potentialities existed in the hon. Member who would correct all the abuses and bring perfection by a wave of his magic wand. He had always found that the English people were good-natured and fair-minded, but that they were not too intelligent. Consul Mitchell said in his report—

> "The presence of certain judicial officers has already had excellent results and has stopped the perpetration of crimes."

Yet this did not prevent an hon. Member from stating in the debate on the Congo question that took place in this House on 15th May last that the Report teemed with atrocities. So much, however, so far as the Reports were concerned, for this topic of atrocities—and let it be borne in mind that the extracts he had quoted from the Reports applied to a time more than a year distant from the present. To come to the question of administration, Vice-Consul Mitchell, dealing with this topic said—

> "The stations" (administrative centres) "are well built and well cared for."

He paid a high tribute to the officials. At page 49 he said—

> "The officials are of excellent class."

And at page 26 he wrote—

> "The activity and good conduct of nearly all the agents I have met is greatly to their credit."

It was true that these Reports were not altogether free from adverse criticism; but it ought to be remembered that they only covered the period ending in December last—that was to say, when the reforms were only beginning to be put in operation. Was it not remarkable, under such circumstances, to find British Consuls paying such high tributes to the officials of an administration which was so despicable according to the Congo Reform Association? To understand the value of the eulogies of the Vice-Consuls from whose Reports he had quoted, it was necessary to put oneself in their places. They knew there was a hysterical agitation going on in this country against the existing administration in the Congo. There was always in politics one class of people who kept their eye on the gallery—who when they saw that a question was becoming popular jumped at it. They knew that these agitators were so fierce that when a former British Minister at Brussels, Sir Constantine Phipps, praised King Leopold at a public ceremony, he was furiously attacked by the so-called Congo reformers. The Vice-Consuls understood the position thoroughly. They knew that the same so-called Congo reformers would highly praise them for any hostile criticism of the existing *régime* in the Congo. If, therefore, in face of such a situation, they bestowed encomiums on the administration of the Congo and on its officials the irresistible inference was that things out there must be widely different from what they were represented to be. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were loud in their protestations that they had no desire to reflect on the Belgian people, had no quarrel with them; that they even sympathised with them, as the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said in the last debate in this House on the Congo question. Let them see how these expressions of sympathy accorded with facts, and by way of throwing a sidelight on the matter, let him refer to another country where atrocities were also said to have occurred. He referred to Western Australia. Some two years ago a Report of the Royal Commissioner, Dr. Roth, was the subject of a discussion in this House. How did the then Government deal with the matter? They asked that time should be given to the local administration in order that abuses might be corrected and the general situation remedied. What had the result been? It had been such that the Bishop of Perth, Western Australia, the Most Rev. Matthew Gibney, writing to the Perth daily papers, strongly denounced the attitude of the Australian authorities towards the blacks. The country, the Bishop said, belonged to the natives, and was taken from them without compensation. The present grant of £10,000 per annum for 12,000 natives was ridiculous.

The starving blacks were driven to depredation, and then arrested, and barbarous treatment followed. Dr. Gibney proceeded—

> "Chaining, though in a milder form, still exists, and there is no mercy for the blacks. There have been many cases of blacks being slaughtered in my time, since 1863. The race is dying out. Their natural support has been taken away. Throughout the Commonwealth kangaroos, opossums, and wild fowl are disappearing before the spread of the sheep and cattle runs of the squatter. The blacks must, therefore, kill cattle and sheep to live. They are then arrested and chained to police horses. They do not understand the charge made against them until they have been convicted and imprisoned in chains night and day. Under this treatment they soon die. The office of Chief Protector in Perth is useless. Intervention by the Imperial Government is necessay."

The right rev. Prelate also complained of the abuses still existing, and said that the situation had not materially altered during the past two years. No discussion has been initiated in this House on the subject. And why? Let them put a charitable construction on it and say that it was because the time given for carrying out great reforms had not been sufficient. If that was the true explanation of the inaction of philanthropists in this House, then hon. Gentlemen were to be commended. They had adopted the proper and statesmanlike course. Rome was not built in a day and the fabric of a great and wise administration, if it was to endure, must have adequate time for its construction. Of course, if the hon. Member for Gravesend had lived he would have run up the sky scrapers of New York in a day. It was however, to be regretted that hon. Gentlemen did not exercise towards the administration of the Congo the same friendly and charitable indulgence that they extended to their kinsmen who were responsible for the government of Western Australia. Did they think the Belgian people did not appreciate the difference between the real sympathy they had shown towards those responsible for the government of Western Australia and the hollow sympathy they professed for them? Let him apply one or two other tests to the good faith of this professed desire for reform in the Congo. Those who were carrying on the campaign for reform in the Congo spoke of the powerful movement of public opinion proceeding in this country on the Congo question. He challenged the strength of the movement—a movement so admirably staged, as Mr. Maxse remarked in an issue of the *National Review* early in the present year. But what about the movement that at one time existed in this country against the opium trade in India? Was it not at one time a most powerful and most influentially supported movement? Was it not a fact that in one session alone this House received no less than 3,352 petitions, signed by hundreds of thousands of people calling for the suppression of that iniquitous trade? What was the result? A Royal Commission was appointed and reported that the trade in opium had to be maintained for financial reasons. That ended the affair, and no more was heard about the pressure of an irresistible movement of public opinion. Did they think the Belgians were ignorant of all this or were unable to deduce from it its moral? If hon. Members were really the friends of Belgium, if the sympathy they professed towards them was something more than mere words, they would be practical, they would give them the time necessary to put in operation the reforms that were decreed a year and two months ago. The interval that had elapsed was utterly inadequate for carrying out great and far-reaching reforms in a country so distant from Europe, so huge in area, so trying in its climate, and inhabited by such a barbarous people. Let him say a few words on this latter topic. In the fierce and sweeping criticisms passed on the present administration of the Congo one never heard a word about the immense difficulty arising from the character of the natives. Yet was that a matter of trivial importance? Could they establish a perfect administration among cannibals as easily and as speedily as they could set up good government among a civilised people. They could not treat cannibals as they would the hon. Member for Gravesend. Did we treat our law-abiding citizens in the same way, and in the same spirit as we treated our criminal classes? Only that he did not wish unduly to take up the time of the Committee he would quote evidence showing the tremendous difficulties arising from the character of the natives of the Congo. King Leopold's reign in the Congo had extended only over twenty-five years, while the Congo was twenty-five times the size of this country. It was to our interest to retain the friendship of the Belgian people, who were not dealing with the Congo in the same way as we dealt with Western Australia. The humanitarians also did not allude to what took place in Uganda, where the natives were much superior to those in the Congo. In Uganda before a king was buried his grave was prepared by a number of natives being hacked about and their arms and legs flung into it. Let them take another illustration. One of the queens in Uganda suffered from toothache, and she was told by her doctor that a human sacrifice was necessary in order to cure her of it. Immediately she ordered all the inhabitants of the village to be driven into a lake. Those were the methods pursued in our own protectorate. Let them test the philanthropy of the humanitarians who exercised themselves so much about the Congo. They professed great concern for the natives of the Congo. They wept tears over the alleged mutilations of the bodies of negroes in the Congo. Had they any regard for the souls of the French people? They had seen the crucifix torn down from the Courts of Justice in France. They had seen religion proscribed in France; they had seen the ministers of religion prosecuted and fined; they had seen the nuns whose work was to feed the starving and tend the sick driven from their country; they had seen the churches closed or handed over to the municipalities; they had seen £50,000,000 worth of Church property confiscated. He did not now speak of the seizure by an unprincipled Government of private papers and the publication of their contents, nor of the erasing of the name of God from the French coinage nor other such details. What had the philanthropists been doing while all these iniquities had been in course of perpetration? Not a sign of indignation had they given, not a move had they made to stay these enormities—although having an *entente cordiale* with the French Government they naturally had a right to make representations as to their public acts and policy—not a word had the humanitarians uttered during all this carnival of desecration—and yet in face of all this they were asked to believe in their philanthropy. He confessed the demand on his credulity was greater than it could respond to. He believed that a highly placed personage in this country, whom all admired, did intervene, but these humanitarians had no necessity to do so. He would like to draw attention to the International aspect of the question. In the centre of Europe there was a great nation highly organised for the work of war and not deficient in the arts of peace. The country to which he referred was hostile to the British Empire, and it was not impossible that one day or another a conflict would be precipitated between this country and that. In such a case it might be well for this country to have the friendship of Belgium, not on account of any assistance she might be able to give, but on account of the strategic position of the country to which he referred. He urged the House not hopelessly to antagonise the people of Belgium. Let the Government withdraw from the position they had taken up; a position into which they had been driven by people who were principally fools, frauds, and fanatics. Let us attend to our own business and Belgium to hers, and when the Government had shown themselves a little more successful in dealing with affairs at home, when they had done something to mitigate the state of affairs in Macedonia and to ameliorate the conditions in India and Ireland, it would be time enough for them to turn their attention to the Congo.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) said the Congo *régime* had found a most eloquent and able advocate in his hon. friend, and so far as his hon. friend had denounced evils happening in the Congo or in other parts of the world he entirely agreed with him. His sympathy was not limited to victims of persecution in one country as against those in another. He wished to make it quite clear that in this matter he, like his hon. friend, was expressing his individual opinion, because he thought it would be very unfortunate if an impression were to be left in the minds of hon. Members or the country that the Irish Party was in any sense committed against the reform of the Congo.

MR. McKEAN: I never suggested it for a moment.

MR. HUGH LAW: I know.

MR. McKEAN: If I did not suggest it I fail to see the necessity for this explanation.

MR. HUGH LAW said his hon. friend last year made an exceedingly eloquent speech in defence of the Congo, which he was quite entitled to do. His hon. friend was the only speaker, and certainly the impression left on the minds of many on that occasion was that the Irish Members were against reform in the Congo. It was well known that the hon. Member for East Mayo, whose absence, and the reasons that caused it, they all deplored, did not associate himself with this matter, though he had denounced in no measured terms evils which existed under the British flag. It was said that the motives of those who were preaching Congo reform in this country were not pure. That might be so. It might be that there were trade motives, he did not know. But it did not alter the fact that evils existed. It was also said that similar or worse evils happened under the British flag. He was afraid very evil things indeed happened under the British flag, but that did not alter the fact that evils existing in one place was no reason why we should be silent as to the evils which happened in another, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would, when he rose, be able to tell the House that Belgium herself would take vigorous action against what prevailed in the Congo. No one would suggest that Belgium was incapable of ruling these races so far as a great part of the Congo was concerned. He believed his hon. friend was right in saying that in many parts the administration was excellent; but when they came to the rubber territory things appeared to be far different. His hon. friend had in this connection quoted the report of Mr. G. Grey, but it had been pointed out in the previous debate that that gentleman was not in the rubber district. The real vice of the Congo system was the collection of rubber. There was the identification of the State with a trading concern, and it mattered not how excellent or how humane the officials might be who were sent to administer the country under the system. The common experience was that where the whole system of government was based upon the amount of money that could be made out of the country evils of the most terrible description were bound to follow, and everyone had a right to condemn a system of government based on exploiting the country as a trading concern. He turned now to a country under the British flag. When at this time, or a little earlier, last year, a debate took place on this Vote, the hon. Member for East Mayo raised the question of the incident which had occurred a few weeks previously at Denshawi. The right hon. Gentleman then made a strong appeal to the House not to discuss the question. He said he had promised a full report of the evidence and urged that the discussion should be deferred until it was published. The hon. Member for East Mayo not unnaturally said he had heard of such things before; that when the question was brought up again they would be asked, "Why go back to this unhappy transaction?" It was quite true that by the earlier telegrams a painful impression was created; and in reference to the executions, they were assured by those in charge of them, in their best official style, that they were carried out in a respectable manner which reflected the greatest credit on all concerned. In what other respects than the carrying out of these executions did the official Papers make the case any better? It seemed to him that they made the case worse. From the first telegrams which were received it seemed that there had been an absolutely unprovoked attack on these officers, and it was reported that one had been killed on the spot, and another seriously injured. What was the story of what took place? It appeared that shooting was not allowed without the consent of the head man of the village. However, shooting was commenced by the officers, to all intents and purposes at domestic fowls, exactly in the same way as if someone arrived in a farmyard in England and proceeded to shoot the farmyard fowls. A menacing crowd gathered round, very much excited, and through some cause, as yet unexplained, a thrashing floor caught fire. The explanation given by the peasants was that this was caused by the shot which was fired. The official report appeared to him to be utterly incredible, because it stated that the thrashing floor was deliberately set fire to by the owner himself—certainly for signalling a revolt a somewhat expensive form of torch. A scuffle took place in the course of which one of the wives of the villagers was wounded; it was believed she was killed, but afterwards it was found that she was not very seriously hurt. Naturally the riot became worse; the officers were mobbed, and they certainly received some brutal treatment. Two of them ran for help; they had undoubtedly received certain injuries, but apparently they must have been less injured than the others, or they would not have been sent to get help. In the hot sun of an Egyptian afternoon, it appeared from the medical evidence, one of these two officers sustained sunstroke, and was subsequently found dead. Another officer to whom the right hon. Gentleman had referred as still incapacitated, was Lieutenant Smithwick.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) said he had stated that the officer was incapacitated for a long time, but he did not know what his present condition was.

Mr. HUGH LAW asked if he was right in concluding that the reference was to Lientenant Smithwick.

Sir EDWARD GREY said he had forgotten exactly, but he thought the officer's rank was that of captain.

Mr. HUGH LAW said he asked that question, because a second person was seriously injured. He found from the report that Lieutenant Smithwick was injured and his arm was broken. He did not know whether there were two of the same name.

Sir EDWARD GREY said what he had in his mind was that one of the officers, some weeks after, had not at all recovered. It appeared that his injuries had turned out to be more serious than had been thought, and he had not then recovered.

Mr. HUGH LAW said it might well have been that a man thought not to be seriously injured really was seriously injured, and that one who was thought to be seriously injured was not really seriously injured. But turning to what had occurred, he did not think the right hon. Gentleman would seriously say that he had misrepresented the incident. But, he asked, if such an incident had occurred in England, and the accused had been brought before an English Judge and jury, was it conceivable that they would have been punished by the execution of even one man? He had read the report carefully and he had really no feeling in the matter, but he was sorry to say that he could see no evidence whatever that there was any premeditation; nor could he see how any jury in England could possibly have brought in a verdict of murder, or even of manslaughter. If there was murder at Denshawi, it was not a murder committed by the villagers; it was a judicial murder committed with the approval of the Egyptian Government, and he was sorry to say, of the Home Government. What was the position of the Egyptian Judges? Unless he was greatly misinformed the Egyptian Judges had no security of tenure; their position was exactly parallel with that of a Court constituted by two Irish resident magistrates. What were the sentences of that court so constituted? He asserted again that if it had been the question of a Court in England, it was inconceivable that anyone would have suffered more than a year or two years imprisonment, taking all the circumstances into account. Yet four men had been hanged, two sent to penal servitude for life, one being the man whose wife was shot; one for fifteen years, six for seven years, three to one year and fifty lashes, and five to fifty lashes. He thought the inference was abundantly plain that it was considered necessary to inflict these punishments, not in the interests of justice but in the interests of the British occupation of Egypt. It was perfectly obvious that they were intended to inspire fear, and to check the spirit of insubordination to which Mr. Findlay referred in his dispatch, stating in very superior official style that it was his duty to warn them of the deplorable effect produced by Members of Parliament in questioning the unanimous sentences passed by the Court. Because there had been six cases of brutal murder and assault in a population of he did not know how many millions, Mr. Findlay, filled with terror and horror, implored them to keep silence; and the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in trembling accents of intense earnestness, had also implored them to keep silence lest they should set the whole world in a blaze. It was perfectly obvious that it was not in deference to any feelings of justice to be done, but under the influence of panic, that these savage punishments were inflicted. He would make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman, whose humanity he did not question. It was too late to appeal about the four men who were executed, but it was not too late, now the panic was past, to order the early release of those who were still suffering. He could not think that the right hon. Gentleman would seriously contend that the man whose wife was shot before his eyes should spend the rest of his days in penal servitude, and that all the others should serve their terms. What about the story of that police official who gave evidence contrary to the official account, and who was with the officers at the time? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give them a satisfactory assurance upon that point. He thought the time had now arrived when the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should deal more fully with the matter. Turning to another subject, it was a matter of great regret that the condition of Macedonia was still very unsatisfactory. He did not think it mattered much whether that state of things was directly due to the action of Turkey or to the ordinary Christian sects. It made very little difference from what quarter pillage and murder came. Though the Turks might not be the direct aggressors it was due to the Turkish system of government that these things were allowed to continue. In other parts of the world exactly the same thing was happening in Eastern Roumania and Bulgaria before the Turkish rule was taken off. He was aware there were great difficulties in dealing with this question, but he wished to urge upon the Government the necessity for making an effort to obtain a reduction of the military expenditure in Macedonia in order that the money saved might be applied to civil reforms. He also desired to urge the necessity of giving more power to the gendarmerie, because their position now was most humiliating. They sent out the best men they could find to train recruits; they went out with powers of inspection and were placed in nominal command of Turkish non-commissioned officers, but they had really no power to move a single man without orders from their superior officers, and their main duty was to make inspections and furnish reports. If those officers knew trouble was anticipated in a certain village, instead of taking their men to that place they had to sit down and ask for leave, and probably after the massacre had occurred they had the privilege of going to the place, taking photographs, and writing reports. He hoped further powers would be given to the European officers connected with the gendarmerie. As in Egypt and the Congo State, they expected something more in the long run than had been done. They looked to the right hon. Baronet as a Liberal Minister to show himself as anxious for thorough reform in connection with this matter as his Conservative predecessor. So far as his term of office was concerned it did not compare very favourably in this respect with that of his immediate predecessor. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had a great opportunity before him, for he enjoyed the confidence of both sides of the House, and his appointment was received with general approval. The country he represented occupied a position greater and more powerful perhaps than that of any other of the Powers concerned. During his term of office possibly some enemies and rivals had been turned into friends, and others had, through various circumstances of war and internal strife, found themselves in the position in which it was impossible for them to interfere in any of these projects. He hoped the right hon. Baronet would rise to the level of the great opportunities which now presented themselves to him.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) said he did not want to underrate the importance of the debate. Indeed, he would much rather add a word of protest against the very small amount of time usually allotted to the discussion of Foreign Affairs in that House. Last year they had a debate in Committee of Supply, and again on Report, but this year they had only had a debate on Report. The subject he wished to speak upon was the voluminous correspondence which had recently been presented to Parliament in connection with Macedonia and the Turkish Customs question. The House would remember that they were at present engaged in a great work in Macedonia. The Government not only retained a certain number of Consuls there, but we were also represented by a delegate on the Financial Commission of Macedonia, and this country had recently made a considerable sacrifice in regard to the Turkish Customs duties. On 23rd May last he brought forward a Motion to the effect that further reforms were urgently required in Macedonia in the interests alike of the Christian and Mohammedan population, and that Motion was unanimously carried. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs upon that occasion said, first, that a decrease in the military expenditure for Macedonia had already been effected; and secondly, that he thought it would be impossible to expect the other Powers to join in any collective action of a serious kind until they had had at least one year's experience of the working of the present financial scheme. That was a year ago. He wished to point out that there had been a continuous increase in the military expenditure of Macedonia. He had the figures for the year 1905–6, in which year the military expenditure was double the civil expenditure, and amounted to £1,303,000. In the year 1906–7 the military expenditure increased to £1,344,000, and this year the estimated military expenditure for Macedonia was no less than £1,352,000. Therefore, there had been a progressive increase during the last three years. The second year to which the right hon. Baronet referred had now elapsed, and something in addition had happened. This country, as well as the other Powers, had allowed Turkey a 3 per cent. increase on the Customs duties, which would bring in an additional sum for Macedonia of about £600,000 a year. Under those circumstances he thought the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had a right to demand that the cause of reform should now go forward in Macedonia. He hoped to see those expectations realised. He, for one, entirely approved of the action of the right hon. Gentleman in working in this matter in a friendly spirit with the Turkish Government. Personally, he saw no possibility of effecting reforms in Macedonia unless they got them carried out amicably. If hon. Members in that House and the Press generally kept vilifying the head of the Turkish Government the position of the British Ambassador became one of exceptional difficulty. The sovereignty of the Sultan in Macedonia must be upheld; otherwise the various Balkan States would be encouraged in their struggles one against the other. He was prepared to go further and say that it was only by giving the Balkan States to understand that England would not countenance any idea of the partition of Turkish territory in those regions that they were ever likely to establish peace in Macedonia. At the same time he would remind the House that under Article 22 of the Berlin Treaty Macedonia was handed back not to the absolute but to the limited sovereignty of the Sultan. The Sultan realised that his constitutional position in Macedonia was a limited sovereignty, and by Article 22 of the Berlin Treaty it was made subject to the introduction of autonomous institutions, or such institutions as would be compatible with the needs of the people. That article in the Berlin Treaty clearly laid down that regulations should be introduced for the government of Macedonia analogous to those introduced in Crete, which included a Governor-General, a reform of the law-courts and an elected legislative assembly. The hon. Member for Donegal was clearly right when he said that what they expected of English policy in Macedonia was that it should be progressive. If that country was not now prepared for autonomy, steps should be taken at any rate to reform the judiciary and improve the local administration. The state of Macedonia, he was sure, nobody would deny was a woefully bad one. In the towns outrages were openly committed; when people were sitting in a restaurant, a man might appear at the window with a revolver and shoot them, and that man would escape. Outrages of that kind were being committed every day and it was difficult to see where the protection of the Turkish troops came in. He noticed that the Blue-book recently issued only went down to the month of November, the month of December being omitted, and there was no synoptical table to show the amount of crime. He hoped that would be remedied in future Blue-books. Consequently he had to go to the figures furnished by the right hon. Baronet, and he found that in 1905 the average number of violent deaths from the 1st of January to the end of August were ninety-eight a month, whereas in 1906 the figure for the corresponding period was 138. The large total of 200 a month was usual in the summer months. Let the House realise that there had been an actual increase in the number of violent deaths for the year 1906, although the Financial Commission had been established and the gendarmerie effectively increased. To what was this lamentable condition of things due? Mainly to the activity of the bands. What was the object of these bands? The House would remember that Austria-Hungary and Russia had primarily made themselves responsible for the government of Macedonia. They took this work in hand under a programme of reforms. One Article of that programme provided that, directly peace had been established in Macedonia, the Porte should be required to arrange administrative districts, with a view to a more regular grouping of the different nationalities. That Article encouraged the different nationalities of the Balkan States to think that if only they could peg out a claim for a certain district of Macedonia, when peace came their countrymen would be placed in that particular district; and ultimately, when the Turkish Empire had disappeared altogether, that particular district would be added to their particular country—Servia, Bulgaria or Greece. That was really the reason of the activity of these bands in Macedonia, to whose depredations most of these violent deaths were due. These young nationalities—the Phœnixes that had risen from the ashes of the Turkish Empire in Europe—had become vultures and were preying upon the remnants of that Empire in Europe. So long as they were encouraged to think that they would be able to get a slice of Macedonia, so long there would certainly be no peace or reform in that country. He contended that if only the futility of such hopes could be made plain to the Governments of Greece, Bulgaria, and Servia, there should be no difficulty in maintaining order in Macedonia. Macedonia was a country not much larger than Scotland. It was not the whole of Macedonia that was disturbed. It was divided into fifteen administrative districts, and out of these only four were described by our Consul-General as belonging to the really disturbed area. A very small part of the country was in a disturbed condition, and yet order could not be maintained by a body of troops numbering 80,000. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean said that we were in Macedonia pursuing what he called an Austrian policy. He trusted that an Austrian policy had not been pursued. He would pass now to another subject in close connection with Macedonia. Hon. Members who had followed the discussion of the matter would remember that the Customs had been increased in order to supply money for the carrying out of reforms in Macedonia—that was to say in order to supply a deficit which was said to exist in the Budget of Macedonia. This question of the increased Customs duties had taken at least a year and a half to negotiate.

his term of office possibly some enemies and rivals had been turned into friends, and others had, through various circumstances of war and internal strife, found themselves in the position in which it was impossible for them to interfere in any of these projects. He hoped the right hon. Baronet would rise to the level of the great opportunities which now presented themselves to him.

Mr. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) said he did not want to underrate the importance of the debate. Indeed, he would much rather add a word of protest against the very small amount of time usually allotted to the discussion of Foreign Affairs in that House. Last year they had a debate in Committee of Supply, and again on Report, but this year they had only had a debate on Report. The subject he wished to speak upon was the voluminous correspondence which had recently been presented to Parliament in connection with Macedonia and the Turkish Customs question. The House would remember that they were at present engaged in a great work in Macedonia. The Government not only retained a certain number of Consuls there, but we were also represented by a delegate on the Financial Commission of Macedonia, and this country had recently made a considerable sacrifice in regard to the Turkish Customs duties. On 23rd May last he brought forward a Motion to the effect that further reforms were urgently required in Macedonia in the interests alike of the Christian and Mohammedan population, and that Motion was unanimously carried. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs upon that occasion said, first, that a decrease in the military expenditure for Macedonia had already been effected; and secondly, that he thought it would be impossible to expect the other Powers to join in any collective action of a serious kind until they had had at least one year's experience of the working of the present financial scheme. That was a year ago. He wished to point out that there had been a continuous increase in the military expenditure of Macedonia. He had the figures for the year 1905–6, in which year the military expenditure was double the civil expenditure, and amounted to £1,303,000. In the year 1906–7 the military expenditure increased to £1,344,000, and this year the estimated military expenditure for Macedonia was no less than £1,352,000. Therefore, there had been a progressive increase during the last three years. The second year to which the right hon. Baronet referred had now elapsed, and something in addition had happened. This country, as well as the other Powers, had allowed Turkey a 3 per cent. increase on the Customs duties, which would bring in an additional sum for Macedonia of about £600,000 a year. Under those circumstances he thought the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had a right to demand that the cause of reform should now go forward in Macedonia. He hoped to see those expectations realised. He, for one, entirely approved of the action of the right hon. Gentleman in working in this matter in a friendly spirit with the Turkish Government. Personally, he saw no possibility of effecting reforms in Macedonia unless they got them carried out amicably. If hon. Members in that House and the Press generally kept vilifying the head of the Turkish Government the position of the British Ambassador became one of exceptional difficulty. The sovereignty of the Sultan in Macedonia must be upheld; otherwise the various Balkan States would be encouraged in their struggles one against the other. He was prepared to go further and say that it was only by giving the Balkan States to understand that England would not countenance any idea of the partition of Turkish territory in those regions that they were ever likely to establish peace in Macedonia. At the same time he would remind the House that under Article 22 of the Berlin Treaty Macedonia was handed back not to the absolute but to the limited sovereignty of the Sultan. The Sultan realised that his constitutional position in Macedonia was a limited sovereignty, and by Article 22 of the Berlin Treaty it was made subject to the introduction of autonomous institutions, or such institutions as would be compatible with the needs of the people. That article in the Berlin Treaty clearly laid down that regulations should be introduced for the government of Macedonia analogous to those introduced in Crete, which included a Governor-General, a reform of the law-courts and an elected legislative assembly. The hon. Member for Donegal was clearly right when he said that what they expected of English policy in Macedonia was that it should be progressive. If that country was not now prepared for autonomy, steps should be taken at any rate to reform the judiciary and improve the local administration. The state of Macedonia, he was sure, nobody would deny was a woefully bad one. In the towns outrages were openly committed; when people were sitting in a restaurant, a man might appear at the window with a revolver and shoot them, and that man would escape. Outrages of that kind were being committed every day and it was difficult to see where the protection of the Turkish troops came in. He noticed that the Blue-book recently issued only went down to the month of November, the month of December being omitted, and there was no synoptical table to show the amount of crime. He hoped that would be remedied in future Blue-books. Consequently he had to go to the figures furnished by the right hon. Baronet, and he found that in 1905 the average number of violent deaths from the 1st of January to the end of August were ninety-eight a month, whereas in 1906 the figure for the corresponding period was 138. The large total of 200 a month was usual in the summer months. Let the House realise that there had been an actual increase in the number of violent deaths for the year 1906, although the Financial Commission had been established and the gendarmerie effectively increased. To what was this lamentable condition of things due? Mainly to the activity of the bands. What was the object of these bands? The House would remember that Austria-Hungary and Russia had primarily made themselves responsible for the government of Macedonia. They took this work in hand under a programme of reforms. One Article of that programme provided that, directly peace had been established in Macedonia, the Porte should be required to arrange administrative districts, with a view to a more regular grouping of the different nationalities. That Article encouraged the different nationalities of the Balkan States to think that if only they could peg out a claim for a certain district of Macedonia, when peace came their countrymen would be placed in that particular district; and ultimately, when the Turkish Empire had disappeared altogether, that particular district would be added to their particular country—Servia, Bulgaria or Greece. That was really the reason of the activity of these bands in Macedonia, to whose depredations most of these violent deaths were due. These young nationalities—the Phœnixes that had risen from the ashes of the Turkish Empire in Europe—had become vultures and were preying upon the remnants of that Empire in Europe. So long as they were encouraged to think that they would be able to get a slice of Macedonia, so long there would certainly be no peace or reform in that country. He contended that if only the futility of such hopes could be made plain to the Governments of Greece, Bulgaria, and Servia, there should be no difficulty in maintaining order in Macedonia. Macedonia was a country not much larger than Scotland. It was not the whole of Macedonia that was disturbed. It was divided into fifteen administrative districts, and out of these only four were described by our Consul-General as belonging to the really disturbed area. A very small part of the country was in a disturbed condition, and yet order could not be maintained by a body of troops numbering 80,000. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean said that we were in Macedonia pursuing what he called an Austrian policy. He trusted that an Austrian policy had not been pursued. He would pass now to another subject in close connection with Macedonia. Hon. Members who had followed the discussion of the matter would remember that the Customs had been increased in order to supply money for the carrying out of reforms in Macedonia—that was to say in order to supply a deficit which was said to exist in the Budget of Macedonia. This question of the increased Customs duties had taken at least a year and a half to negotiate.

It formed the subject of a voluminous and interesting Blue-book. Let him as publicly as he could congratulate the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the way in which he had handled this difficult question, and on the distinct improvement which he had obtained on the terms which this country was originally prepared to accept. If the House would compare the terms which this country was prepared to accept in March, 1906, with the terms we had actually obtained, they would at once be able to measure the improvement which had been effected in the negotiations by the right hon. Gentleman, and at the same time they would be able to see how far-reaching the question was. There was one point in this connection on which he would like to ask for information. One of the conditions to which the right hon. Gentleman had consented was that the increase should be for a period of seven years. The French Government, since 1906, had been constantly pressing upon the Porte that the Financial Commission, which was the instrument for reform in Macedonia, was only set up for the space of two years, and that the increased Customs should only be allowed for so long a period as the Commission was to last. The term of the Financial Commission would very soon come to an end. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to assure the House that its tenure would be extended to as long a period as the Customs surtax. He would have very much preferred if the right hon. Gentleman when he came into office had entirely dissociated himself and this country from those proposals to increase the Customs. That was his strong view, but the right hon. Gentleman differed from him. The reason why he objected to the increase of the Customs was that he felt convinced that the refusal to increase the duties would not really be a deterrent to the reforms in Macedonia. He thought the Blue-book bore out his contention to the letter. He had been putting Questions to the right hon. Gentleman during the whole of the summer, and though the information he obtained was of considerable value it certainly was not complete. It did not reveal a very important aspect of the question which was for the first time revealed in the Report of the British Financial Commissioner. It now appeared that there was no deficit in Macedonia. There was an apparent deficit but there was no real deficit. How did the matter stand? They were told by the right hon. Gentleman that the annual deficit in the Macedonian Budget was £750,000 or over, and for that reason they had been asked to find additional Customs duties amounting to £560,000. This was a bogus deficit. In the first place the Macedonian Budget was saddled with the cost of 80,000 soldiers who were there to protect Turkey from aggression on the part of Bulgaria or any other foreign nation. The 80,000 troops in Macedonia were not kept there to preserve order, but to protect Turkey as a whole from aggression from the side of the Balkan States. Yet the entire cost of this huge army was borne by the Macedonian people, and debited to the Macedonian Budget. But even including the whole of this military expenditure, the way in which the Foreign Office had arrived at the deficit was by omitting certain large items of revenue. For instance, no account was taken of indirect taxation. Now, indirect taxation was a form of collecting revenue known to every country; and yet the revenue from Customs levied in Macedonia had been entirely omitted from the Budget. In the second place, there were such revenues as the salt tax, which were the very best revenues that Turkey possessed, and these revenues—known as ceded revenues—were also collected in Macedonia as well as in other parts of the Empire; but they were entirely excluded for the purpose of arriving at the figure on the credit side of the Macedonian Budget. The revenue from Customs amounted to £245,000 a year, and that from salt and other such taxes to £218,000 a year. The real deficit was therefore not £747,778 for 1906–7, but about £284,778. Further, if the kilometric guarantees for railways, amounting to £322,000, were deducted from the expenditure column, to which they did not properly belong, there would, instead of a deficit be a surplus of £37,222.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Why should not Macedonia pay the kilometric guarantees?

MR. LYNCH said because the railways were constructed not for the benefit of Macedonia only, but to establish through railway communications for European Turkey. The truth was that this increase in the Customs had been manipulated by certain Powers in such a manner as to set free for the purpose of kilometric guarantees some of the best revenues that Turkey possessed. The Powers ought to have required that the ceded revenues for Turkey as whole, which in 1910 would show a surplus of £500,000 a year, should first be placed into the pot, so to speak, by Turkey for the benefit of the administration of Macedonia, if there really was a deficit in the Budget of that province, before she should come to the Powers for additional funds in the shape of increased Customs duties. As matters now stood there was nothing to prevent the financial benefit derived by Turkey from the increase in the Customs from resulting in a guarantee for the great German strategic railway to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf. It was Germany which prevented any mortgage being placed upon the ceded revenues. Our delegate on the Public Debt Commission tried to insist that these revenues should be put in as a collateral security, but the German Ambassador objected to the application of those funds to the benefit of Macedonia as heretofore. Our trade was at present double that of any other country with Turkey, amounting to about seven to eight million pounds in imports alone. Germany, however, was rapidly creeping up, making her way by the control of communications. But the kilometric guarantees were ruinous to Turkey. They amounted in Macedonia alone to £322,000 a year, and in all Turkey to £800,000 a year. There was only one line in the whole of Turkey which did not ask for a guarantee, viz., the British railway from Smyrna to Aidin. There was, he believed, a certain railway which did not take the trouble to publish a timetable but sent its trains when it liked. It lived on its kilometric guarantee. He hoped a watchful eye would be kept by the Foreign Office on the large revenues which would be set free in 1910 owing to the present increase in the Customs. We shall have a perfect right to demand that such revenues should not be spent in providing kilometric guarantees, but that they should be devoted to the improvement of the administration in Macedonia or elsewhere. It was said that an agreement had been, or was about to be made between this country and Russia; and the right hon. the Foreign Secretary in answer to a Question from the hon. Member for Leicester said that that agreement simply dealt with frontier questions. He thought there must be other considerations which would come into an agreement of this kind. It probably had a much wider application, and would apply to our relations to Persia. Personally he did not believe the Russians would ever attempt to invade India through Afghanistan, but such an invasion, if it were ever contemplated, which he did not wish to suggest, would be through Persia and the Persian Gulf. The object of any Power like Russia would be peacefully and gradually to absorb Persia. That Russia had been following the practice of peaceful penetration, and doing it most successfully was shown by the statistics of our trade and of Russian trade with Persia. When he was in Persia many years ago, at the same time as Lord Curzon, both of them made a careful estimate of the relative proportion of British and Russian trade in the country, and they came to the conclusion that the trade of the two countries, Russia and England, was about the same in volume. Now he found by the Returns of the Customs that the average foreign trade of Persia for the last few years had been £10,000,000, of which Russia was credited with £5,500,000, and Great Britain with only £2,500,000. That was entirely due to that system of peaceful commercial penetration. He submitted that it was our duty to see that the relative disadvantage of this country as compared with Russia should not be progressive, and that in future years the trade of Persia should be more equitably divided between the two great Powers bordering upon Persia.

If we did not, what would certainly happen would be that Russian goods would flow in, all Persia would be covered by Russian railways, and Persia would in time become practically a Russian province. How did that bear on the scope of the proposed Agreement? As he understood it, the scheme for the Anglo-Russian Agreement would be that there would be a sphere of influence in Persia for Russia, and another sphere of influence for Great Britain, while there would also be a neutral zone in which either Power would be free to obtain concessions as it pleased. If the Russian sphere of influence comprised the heads or outlets of some of our principal communications, then it would be easy for Russia to obtain concessions for communicatious in her own sphere, and then apply to the Persian Government for permission to continue these communications through the neutral zone until in time the British communications would be destroyed. The principal avenues of the British import trade into Persia were at present as follows:—Bagdad-Kirmanshah, with a trade of about £650,000 a year; Bushire-Shiraz, £550,000 a year; Bunder-Abbas to Kirman, £340,000 a year; Trebizond-Tabriz, £300,000 a year. All these routes, except that from Trebizond, proceeeded from the Gulf, or from the plains at the head of the Gulf, to the great cities of Persia situated on the tableland, and if on any of those routes a portion of the table-land, approaching the great cities, was within the Russian sphere it would be a very bad day for British trade in Persia. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to give this matter earnest consideration.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) wished to recall the attention of the House to the diplomatic and administrative services in regard to British trade. There had been an alteration in regard to the commercial *attachés* previously stationed at Berlin, the capital of Austro-Hungary, and Madrid, who were now situated in London. He should like to ask why this change had been made. In reply to a Question the Foreign Secretary said that the practice of sending *attachés* abroad was not altogether satisfactory; but if so, why was it satisfactory in Japan, China, Turkey, and France? Why was it satisfactory in one case and not in another? He also called attention to a Report made in 1903 by a Committee presided over by the Marquess of Lansdowne in regard to constitution of the Consular service, which dwelt on the importance of introducing into that service recruits who had had some commercial training. It would be a great advantage if men who had had four or five years business experience could be introduced into the Consular service, and he wanted to know why the recommendation of that Committee had not been carried out. The quality of the Consular reports very much depended upon the character of the men who made them. They were brought before the public by the *Board of Trade Journal*. That Journal, which was published at the price of 3d., would be more widely distributed if a lower price were charged for it. Our trade was handicapped by hostile tariffs, and any knowledge on the subject which could be gained was of great importance. He hoped the Department would see that the standard of efficiency of these officers was kept up.

*Mr. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough) desired to add a few words on the subject of Macedonia because some hon. Members felt that a heavy responsibility rested upon this country with regard to that matter. In the first place, there was a general responsibility, because, as the late Duke of Argyll had well and truly said, Turkey in Europe could not have existed for a single year if we had not been her patron and protector. We had been responsible from the time we decided to pursue the policy which led up to the Crimean War. But there was also a special responsibility upon us with regard to Macedonia, because in 1878 Lord Salisbury made it his boast that he had replaced under the direct political and military rule of the Sultan two-thirds of the territory which the Treaty of St. Stefano had assigned to Bulgaria; that is he had put that country — the very country in which these appalling outrages and massacres had taken place — back once more under the blighting rule of the Turk. Therefore, in this matter, we were doubly responsible. He wished to enter his protest against the line of argument which sought to fix the whole responsibility for the disorders in Macedonia upon the Greek, Bulgarian, or Servian bands. He did not deny that there might be some question as to the "balance of criminality" as between Greek and Bulgarian. They had lately heard serious charges brought against the Greek Government with regard to those bands. If those charges were true, even Philhellenes, like himself, would be ready to give support to any measure which the right hon. Gentleman might think fit to take, in conjunction with the other Powers, in order to coerce Greece, or any other State that might be found offending. But he asserted that the real criminal in this matter was the Turkish Government—if such a name could be given to a system which was little better than organised brigandage. It was the Turkish Government which was responsible for the existence of these bands. Instead of exerting itself to put them down, Turkey had been content to play them off against each other. He only wished they could say with Mr. Gladstone, let the Turks now carry off their abuses in the only possible way, viz.: by carrying off themselves; let them go "bag and baggage," if not out of Europe, at least out of this province which they have desolated and profaned. That was the ultimate object which they had in view; but he feared that could not be yet. The hon. Member for Ripon had said that Turkey had 80,000 men in the province of Macedonia, and he was content to let that province remain under Turkish sovereignty, although with 80,000 men they were unable to maintain law and order! He had read an Austrian eulogy upon the Foreign Secretary, with which he thought the right hon. Gentleman would not be entirely pleased, but it stated that the right hon. Gentleman was going to secure "the co-operation of Turkey in the interest of Turkey herself." If that meant that they were to put any faith whatever in the promise of Turkish reform, he did not think the right hon. Gentleman for a single instant did anything of the kind, for anybody who at this time of day placed faith in Turkish promises of reform was blind to all the teaching of history. What they asked was that this country should assert itself in the councils of Europe, and not wait for the two great despotic and reactionary Powers to act. Having regard to the honourable obligations which we had assumed with regard to Macedonia, it was for us to formulate our demands and press them upon the other Powers. Let the military and civil budgets be kept entirely distinct. 80,000 troops was an excessive number; let this country urge their reduction. In that way a saving would be effected, and all the saving could go towards the reforms. Executive power should also be given to the *gendarmerie*, and especially to the Financial Commission. But the keynote of our demands should be control as opposed to mere supervision. There should be an international supreme Court of justice, and a Judge chosen by the Powers; there should also be a large number of public works and especially the making of roads. And the most valuable proposal of all was that made by Lord Lansdowne in 1903, when he suggested that there should be appointed a European governor responsible to the Powers. We were bound in honour to do all we possibly could within the limits of reason and prudence to secure for the unhappy people of Macedonia those elementary human rights of life and property and the honour of their women without which existence was intolerable. He suggested that such a policy was also the safest, because it might avert the danger of the war which some said was inevitable, and which when it came, if come it did, would probably set all Europe in a flame.

*SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury) said that with regard to the question of the administration of the Congo, he noticed the tendency of the speeches made had been in favour of the annexation of the Congo by the Belgian Government. He thought the first question which we should ask ourselves was whether we had any right to interfere at all. He thought that could be answered in the affirmative, because if the records of the Berlin Conference were studied it would be found that the English Ambassador was instructed by Lord Granville to support the views of the German Government in regard to commercial matters, and especially to safeguard the rights of the natives. After the Conference, it was always understood that the Powers had the right of calling one another's attention to any breaches of the Berlin Act; and he was quite sure that other nations had acted on that principle, and had at various times given notice to the British Government of action, such as the importation of arms, etc., alleged to be in violation of the Act. Though we had a perfect right to interfere in regard to this matter of the Congo, yet he thought the House of Commons could with confidence leave the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to choose the moment and the way in which this intervention, when it was called for, should be made. The right hon. Gentleman should not be pressed at present to act, as His Majesty's Government must possess the best advice and the best knowledge in these matters, and would know which would be and which would not be an opportune moment to intervene. If it was the object that Belgium as a country should take over the Congo State, he thought the Belgian Parliament was not likely to be favourably impressed by advice from the Parliament of another nation, however friendly, and they would not be encouraged to take over a State the finances of which might be in considerable confusion. No doubt we considered that we ourselves managed our affairs in Africa better than did other nations. The secret of the condition of things in the Congo was due to the too great haste to be rich; whereas in our Protectorates in the wilder parts of Africa, the Foreign Office and those Departments of the Government to which the conduct of these affairs was entrusted, had always been careful to avoid raising taxation from the natives. If they tried to raise revenue to pay for the trouble they took and the duties they had undertaken, they always gave instructions that if the natives demurred they were not to be pressed. That was the difference between our administration and the administration of the Congo; and he thought, under such conditions, we could afford to go slowly. Belgium had not our traditional history; she was inclined to press forward more quickly. But a nation which had spent £20,000,000 in freeing slaves could afford to go slowly and to spend a few hundreds of thousands a year for the benefit of the millions in Africa entrusted to our care. Ours, however, were not principles which necessarily appealed to Belgium or to any other nation administering affairs in Africa; and he thought they could leave this question of the Congo State with very great confidence in the hands of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs to find the right time and right method of intervention in Belgium, in order to remedy a state of affairs which they all deplored, although they knew the difficulties associated with the great evils to which reference had been made. He had risen, however, to ask the Secretary for Foreign Affairs a question relating to another side of Africa, with which he had always been very much interested, namely, the Sultanate of Zanzibar. It was of very great interest to us in the old days, when it was the centre of the slave trade. We spent large sums of money on a fleet which we kept there in order to suppress that traffic, and at that time Zanzibar was of no very great value to us except as a place where we could keep an eye to see that no slaves were brought in, and we incurred all the expense of stopping the slave supplies in order to put down the slave trade. That trade was now a thing of the past. The steps taken by Lord Salisbury's Government in 1897 had brought slavery practically to an end in the islands. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman how the management of affairs in Zanzibar was now being undertaken, whether they were undertaken in the old way, a Prime Minister being resident with the Sultan, acting under the guidance of a British agent in Zanzibar, or whether a more direct control was being exercised by the Foreign Office. He desired to ask also whether there had been any concessions to company promoters, such as they had seen on the neighbouring mainland, and whether any of those companies had turned their eyes to Zanzibar. It was a fruitful island where a well-organised and well-connected company might carry out works of the greatest utility. If such a company was in existence, and was addressing itself to the Foreign Office at the present moment, he thought, if they could bring forward proposals which would commend themselves to His Majesty's Government, the House would welcome any attempt which should introduce capital into that island,

and secure the development of the very rich territory in which we took so much interest, and in which we had overcome the great difficulties which previously attended the labour question.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he believed that our Government in Egypt was a good Government; we had a great responsibility there, and he was proud of the manner in which it had been discharged. The so-called national movement to release Egypt for the Egyptians meant Egypt for the Sultan. The fellaheen were thoroughly conscious that they were well governed and they were grateful for the blessings received from British rule. He deplored the fact that one of the greatest of British public servants had not received his £50,000 without objection taken in some parts of the House. It was unpleasant to hear our pro-consuls, who were the admiration and envy of other countries, disparaged in the House of Commons, and he believed that outisde the House there was hardly any other assembly wherein one might hear them dealt with in this fashion. Under Lord Cromer's administration the land of Egypt had ceased to be the House of Bondage. But the question on which he had risen to address the House was that of an understanding with Russia. He was not asking the right hon. Gentleman for any information on the subject, with which he believed he was perfectly competent to deal without the help of the House; and perhaps the less information that was given to the House while negotiations were pending the better. But as he had lived along with the Russian peasants, and had taken pains to learn their language, perhaps the House would not think it unbecoming in him as a Russian interpreter if he touched upon the subject. He did not think that the few agitators that came to this country from Russia constituted a satisfactory source of information about the affairs of that Empire. They were told the other day by the Foreign Secretary, through his representative in that House, that any understanding with Russia would be carefully confined to questions between the two Powers in that part of Asia which concerned the Indian frontier; and when he himself asked a supplementary question as to the desirability of a general understanding with Russia, the hon. Gentleman very naturally said that he had no information to give on the subject. He only wished to say that the House was grievously mistaken if they supposed that the whole Russian people were actuated by a strong feeling against their Government. He was not there to defend the Russian administration, neither did he attack it. It probably was, however, the only Government which could maintain order in Russia. What he did object to, and what he thought was a danger to the people both of this country and of Russia, was that everything that was said by the agitators who came here from Russia should be taken for gospel. We only heard one side of the question, and the agitators who came here were few in number and all of one mind. One bit of experience was worth more than they heard from such interested sources. When he was in Russia he lived in a peasant's hut in order to learn the language; and while he was there, it happened that troops came from St. Petersburg, and the Tsarevitch with them. He sat among the elders of the village, when they decided to go out with bread and salt, for they wished to do honour to the Tsarevitch. The Tsarevitch took their bread and salt, and spoke kindly to them. And then they came back to the village and they said—"That is the way in Russia the Royal family love the people and the people love them." Hon. Gentlemen thought that absurd, but that was his actual experience. He thought that actual experience was worth a great deal more than what was written in newspapers in reference to Russia. He was at St. Petersburg once when there was a famine in Russia. The difference between a famine in Russia and in India was that a famine in India was foreseen and prevented, but in Russia it was not, the administration in the latter country being far inferior to that of India, which was, he believed, one of the best in the world. There was a famine in St. Petersburg, and the Tsar, of course all the nobles and gentry following his example, refused to attend any entertainment of any class or kind, while the people were suffering. The people in the village said—"That is the way the Royal family in Russia act; they will not enjoy themselves while the people are suffering." Yes; there were different sorts of men among the members of that family. He spoke to the feeling of the Russian people, and he protested that it was absurd that the people of this country should take it for granted that the people of Russia were a seething mass of discontent, and were all opposed to their Government; and it would be a good thing for the people of this country if there were a general understanding with Russia, which he regretted to see was opposed for sentimental reasons in certain quarters. A general understanding between the two Empires would be of the greatest advantage to the people of both countries; and he had thought it proper to make these few general observations because he was convinced that the Government of Russia, which was democratic at bottom, with an absolute bureaucracy at the top, was not understood by the people of this country. Of course, he despaired of converting anybody, but he thought it desirable to state the facts. In the towns there was great dissatisfaction, but for his own part he had not seen much of it in rural districts, and he had travelled very extensively in the European and Asiatic territories of the Tsar. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would carry out the guarded and limited assurance which he had given him on a previous occasion to the effect that if the inhabitants desired a closer communion nothing would prevent that consummation. Macedonia had been referred to, and upon that subject he would only say that in it the interest in this country was of a remote, not of an immediate character, and that we had sufficient to do in looking after our own affairs without also endeavouring to manage those of our neighbours. Nor could he understand why it should be desirable to impose on the Sultan a species of government of our own devising if, as hon. Members below the gangway and hon. Members below the opposite gangway asserted, we were the sworn oppressors of other countries in India and elsewhere. If we were bad governors, as was absurdly contended, and oppressors of foreign races, it was difficult to understand why the same hon. Gentleman who held this extraordinary creed should desire the extension of our influence over regions at present free from our malign intervention. There was only one other subject to which he desired to allude. Not long since an edict was issued by the Chinese Government regarding the suppression of the opium traffic. Whether or not that edict was to be seriously taken he did not know. Perhaps it was, perhaps it was not, of a different character from other edicts of the same origin; for instance, that raising Confucius from the rank of Sun and Moon to that of Earth and Heaven. But he noticed that dukes and princes were to curb their cravings and that at different ages, and in different ranks, a little differential treatment was allowed. But if the edict was a serious bit of business, and we were accepting it in that light, there was a matter of £3,500,000 or £4,000,000 of revenue involved for India, and he would like to know how the Indian Government was to be recouped for this loss on opium cultivation. He was not opposing the suppression, but he spoke in the interests of the Indian Government and the ryots. The trade in opium between India and China was only a tenth of the whole consumption; and, if we were to take the action suggested, let it be made clear that we did not wish the natives of India to pay for this relief of consciences in this country. Let it be known too what was to be done by Persia, French Indo-China, and the Dutch Governments, who also supplied opium. This matter had not received all the attention it deserved; and these considerations had escaped notice in the high tide of humanitarianism which was to sweep away the accursed traffic. Yet another matter he had to mention, and that was the question of admitting the Central Africa Protectorates to the South African Customs Convention. The difficulty of dealing with Portugal would not be insuperable, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the matter, because British Central Africa occupied rather the position of the Cinderella of the Protectorates. and could not at present be included in the Convention from membership of which it would derive certain advantages.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I must admit that at the beginning of the evening the first speech made by the hon. Member for Dulwich from the Front Bench opposite somewhat opened my eyes. I do not think I realised before he spoke how small a thing foreign affairs was—at all events I had not realised how many and how important were the things outside it. That impression was counteracted by subsequent portions of his speech strictly relevant to the Foreign Office Vote. Of course the hon. Gentleman was entitled to raise the question of the action of the British Government upon the subject of the Sugar Convention on this Vote, and I will deal with some of his criticisms. I will not follow him into matters in which Scotland is concerned, or the Land Bill for England or the fall in securities, but I cannot admit that the question of the sugar duty as he put it forward has nothing to do with fiscal policy. The whole of his speech seems to me to be based on those views on fiscal policy on his part so well known to us all, and upon the assumption that the fiscal arguments he presents to the House with so much clearness and ability are right, and that in the conclusions he arrives at may be found the remedy for almost everything. Now we differ entirely in our views of fiscal policy, and therefore we differ in our view as to what our attitude towards the Sugar Convention should be. The hon. Gentleman complains of the instructions given to the British delegates at Brussels, and says that by our action we have done everything possible to upset the Convention. It almost seemed to me as if he wished to see it upset, provided it was done by the British Government. He intimated that very serious consequences might follow; that Continental nations, irritated at our having withdrawn from the Convention, would proceed to impose countervailing duties on the sugar products exported from the United Kingdom. I suppose that in such a contingency he saw some provisional argument in support of his own theories of fiscal policy. But, before any such thing as that takes place, he must wait until the Convention is actually broken up. And that has not taken place, nor do I know, as far as one can gather from the meetings of the last Sugar Commission, that there is a probability that the Convention will be broken up. But I can tell the hon. Gentleman what the motive of the Government has been in taking their line on the sugar duties. We always felt that for this country to enter into the Sugar Convention on the terms on which the late Government placed it was to put our sugar trade in a somewhat precarious position. We are great consumers; we are comparatively small producers of sugar, even when the Colonies are included. The majority of the other Powers who are parties to the Convention are great producers. One large consumer in a Convention, where the majority of the other parties to the Convention are producers, and where the decision of the majority must prevail, may at any moment find himself in a precarious position. He may find that the tendency is to restrict the markets from which he can buy. That was one of the objections brought by the Liberal Party against the Sugar Convention itself. What we have endeavoured to do is to secure arrangements whereby, supposing the Convention continues and we remain a party to the Convention, we shall be free from any risk of having our markets restricted by the decision of the majority of Powers whose interests at a given moment in the future may not coincide economically with our own. By the proposition which the Government has made for the acceptance of the other Powers, parties to the Convention, we shall be absolutely secure in future that we do not find ourselves artificially bound by the decision of other Powers to a restricted market. The hon. Gentleman opposite complained that we were inconsistent because when we were in opposition we had said that bounties were good things and that now, by leaving the door open for the maintenance of the Convention, instead of denouncing the Convention altogether, we were preventing the re-establishment of bounties, which, according to our own statements in opposition, was a thing which we ought to desire.

MR. BONAR LAW: I did not complain on that ground, but on the definite ground that in the despatch itself the Government said they did not desire to continue the bounties.

SIR EDWARD GREY: My recollection was this—that expressions of opinion from our side, when we were in opposition on the subject of bounties, were not unqualified in favour of bounties as the hon. Gentleman supposed. There is this difference. It is one thing when bounties are already in existence that you should go out of your way to take an active step to put an end to the bounties; it is quite another thing, after they have ceased altogether, that you should go out of your way to see them re-established. I, personally, have never felt that the bounty system is a good one. I have never denied, and I do not think anybody can deny, that the trades connected with sugar in this country did get very great benefits for a certain period from the continental bounties. That undoubtedly was the case. We have heard the success of the jam and pickle trade in this country rather derided; but there is no doubt that these trades have been successful, and if their success has not been so fully admitted on the other side as it is on ours, I think that is rather because under our customs system tariff reformers are rather reluctant to admit the possibility that there can be success. The hon. Gentleman opposite has said that since the Convention has been in existence, the West Indian Colonies had benefited by the disappearance of the bounties. We never denied that under the Sugar Convention benefits might accrue to those parts of the British Empire which produce sugar. What we did contend was that no benefit to a particular part of the Empire should be purchased at the cost of the community as a whole. And when the hon. Gentleman opposite twits us with inconsistency in not unconditionally denouncing the Convention, I would urge that one of the great objections we always brought against the policy of the late Government was that the things they were doing were not things which you could reverse by a stroke of the pen. Suppose that even they had set up a system of tariffs in this country. After tariffs have been in force for a few years it becomes impossible for the Government which succeeds by a stroke of the pen to undo all the mischief. So with the sugar bounties. The late Government entered into that Convention on certain terms, having made certain arrangements with other Powers. We had to consider, when the time came for denouncing the Convention, whether so long as we could do it consistently with our own economic interests it was not our duty to cause the minimum of inconvenience to other Powers by, if possible, not disturbing the arrangements they have made. Our unconditional withdrawal must have meant considerable inconvenience to other Powers, and we thought it right, in the interests of good relations with them, that as we had, under the late Government, entered into a Convention with them, we should not denounce it unconditionally without making to them proposals by freeing us from the penal clause, and yet secure our own interests with the minimum of disturbance to the other Powers. The hon. Gentleman opposite said that some of our prophecies of trouble under the Sugar Convention had not been fulfilled. I think some of his prophecies have not been fulfilled. He said that I and one or two of my colleagues had been called by Lord Rosebery the watch-dogs of the present Government. I am not sure how he made that relevant to his particular argument on the Sugar Convention; but, as he has put it in his argument, I suppose that my reply will be relevant too. He said we had been rather dumb dogs since we were in office. I remember no more frequent prophecy from the hon. Gentleman when we were in Opposition than that when a Liberal Government was formed it would not be a harmonious Government. I can certainly speak in the most unqualified way about foreign policy; but, with regard to other matters also, I have never known any political prophecy more completely falsified than the prophecies that the Liberal Government would not be a harmonious Government. As to the trouble which may ensue from the policy which we have adopted with regard to the Sugar Convention, about which the right hon. Gentleman spoke in such gloomy terms, I would remind him that that prophecy also has not come true. There is a story, relative to many things in life and to many prophecies, of the man who, when he was dying, said, in reviewing his life, that he had had a great deal of trouble in his life, and that most of it had never happened.

MR. BONAR LAW asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he had considered the likelihood of a special duty being put on British confections.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have dealt with that point; I said that could not arise unless the Convention was broken up. Our proposals are now under the consideration of the other Powers; and if they accept our proposals, the Convention will be maintained, and none of those dangers can arise; if they do not accept our proposals and the Convention is broken up, then I have no doubt those possible contingencies have been well considered by the trades of this country, and it is, of course, a consideration which has been present to our minds. But I do not anticipate that it will arise.

Now I pass to the speech of the hon. Member for Donegal, who referred again to a matter which has been dealt with before in the House, and which I have never admitted to be otherwise than a very grave one. I have really nothing to add to what I said the other evening as to the Denshawi sentences. I take no exception to the tone in which the hon. Member opposite referred to the matter. I have never dealt with it but as a most serious incident. I do not know that I can do better than quote the opinion of Lord Cromer—not the opinion which was presented in the White Paper, before he had seen the evidence, but the opinion in his annual Report of this year. He said—

> "In the first place, although I have never entertained the least doubt as regards both the necessity of taking proper and effective measures to punish the attack on the British officers, or the justice of the decisions at which the Court which tried the prisoners arrived, I do not conceal from myself that the episode was calculated to leave on the mind of those who were imperfectly acquainted with Egyptian affairs a wholly erroneous impression of the spirit in which the government and administration of the country has been conducted. This in itself is very much to be regretted."

That is one of the things which I shall always feel about the Denshawi incident, that there is that tendency that it should be taken as typical of what happens under British administration, whereas, on the other hand, it is most exceptional. The circumstances of the time were exceptional, and the whole circumstances of the attack were exceptional. With regard to the consideration of the sentences, the very long sentences which still remain, I did not make any actual promise the other evening, because I was anxious that considerations of clemency should go to the Egyptian Government itself, for after all if clemency is to produce a good effect in Egypt it should be put to the credit of the Egyptian Government, on which the primary responsibility of administration rests. But I hope the hon. Member opposite and other hon. Members realised from the tone of what I said that, although I made no actual promise, I said nothing that would preclude the prospect of the revision of those sentences. Though it may be too early to revise these sentences, it has always seemed to me from the beginning that those sentences of very long terms of imprisonment passed on considerable numbers of people must have been passed at a time when it was thought necessary, owing to the state of feeling in Egypt, to make a very severe example, and that when that state of things had passed away and the act of clemency is no longer likely to be mistaken as an act of weakness, when the feeling of Egypt is calm and favourable, then an act of clemency might be in accord not only with justice but good policy. One further point. The hon. Member opposite criticised my action at a particular time when I asked that the question should not be discussed in the House. I think he said that my accents were those of panic and terror. I am generally told that my accents are too little dramatic. But, whether that be so or not, I would point to this, that the only time I made an appeal was when we had not the evidence and no real information before us. What I urged at that particular moment was that before you have the evidence, and while you have nothing but the actual fact of the sentences before you, at once to rush to the conclusion and to announce that the highest judicial authorities in Egypt were wrong must undermine the whole source of authority in Egypt. But since the evidence has been before the House I have never deprecated discussion nor sought to avoid it.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL asked why, when they on that side implored the right hon. Gentleman to get a telegraphic account of the evidence, did he not do so.

Sir EDWARD GREY: It is impossible to re-try a serious case by telegram.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said the right hon. Gentleman misunderstood him. He had asked that an account should be furnished to the House by telegraph instead of by despatch.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I do not think this is really relevant to the point I have made. I did not withhold from the House any information, and, as I have said, after the information was once available, I never deprecated a grave incident of this kind being discussed or represented it as one that either could or should have been passed without comment in the House of Commons.

Now I pass to more general questions connected with Egyptian government which have been raised. The speech of the hon. Member for Brentford, and there were some things in it with which I cannot agree, was devoted to those subjects of Egyptian government which quite rightly ought to occupy the attention of the House from the point of view of high policy. There is the question of education. I am always against the Home Government attempting to interfere in details of administration; therefore I should always deprecate being asked to send particular instructions that in this or that school special measures should be taken; but I do regard it as the duty of the British Government to make sure that year by year progress goes on in education in Egypt, that the general policy of education is a progressive policy and does not stand still. When you have next year the first annual Report of Sir Eldon Gorst, I am sure you will find that the policy of attention to education and making progress in education is to be continued. I did not quite follow the hon. Member for Brentford when he spoke about the Mahomedan University question and Lord Cromer. In his last report Lord Cromer speaks most sympathetically of the proposal to establish such a University as is in question. He says—

> "A committee of leading Egyptians was recently formed to consider the question of the establishment of a national University. I have carefully read the circular issued by the secretary of the committee. I find nothing in it with which I do not entirely agree. They state that the system of education in this country is incomplete—a statement in which every one will agree—and, after dwelling generally on the desirability of obtaining facilities for higher education than that which can be obtained at the Government professional college, say it is proposed that a University should be created which is solely scientific and literary. Its doors will be wide open for all desirous of learning, irrespective of origin and religion. This is the common ground of interest on which all can meet."

Then Lord Cromer makes some criticism, not in order to discourage the scheme, but in order to secure that the scheme may be realised in the best possible form. The improvement of education, especially higher education, in Egypt is an object which will always be regarded with sympathy and on behalf of which British influence will always be used. Of course, the thing on which progress really depends is the supply of funds. The money taken for education in the Egyptian Budget of 1888 was £70,000; it has now risen to £362,000. Progress must depend on the Egyptian Budget. All we can do is to continue the policy Lord Cromer pursued, which was that every year in drawing up the Egyptian Budget there should be some choice made, corresponding to the means at the disposal of the Egyptian Government, as to what reforms should be actually prosecuted in that particular year. This was one of the great merits of Lord Cromer's administration. He ensured that when money was available for reforms in Egypt it was not frittered away from want of concentration, by choosing something special every year to be assisted, so that some progress was made every year with one reform or another.

Dr. RUTHERFORD: Will the right hon. Gentleman bring pressure to bear on the Egyptian Government to provide funds for this University which is so essentially needed?

Sir EDWARD GREY: My meaning is that you cannot promise to provide funds for one particular thing until you have considered whether other things may not be more pressing, such as improved housing, water supply, etc. One must leave it to the Egyptian Government to decide which reform shall be taken up in a particular year. Although the particular reform must be left to the Egyptian Government, the policy of spending as much as possible every year in improving the condition of the country is a policy which will be consistently followed, and the subject of education is one which is recognised as one of those which are most important to the progress and welfare of the country. With regard to the teaching of Arabic, there is no disposition on the part of the Egyptian Government to oust the teaching of that language, but the teaching of English, French, or some other European language does form a large part of education, because there is a very large demand for is, and it was found that schools which do not provide opportunities of learning European languages were schools to which parents did not care to send their children. But the teaching of Arabic is a matter which will never be treated with neglect by the Egyptian Government. When, however, you come to the higher standards, one of the difficulties about teaching Arabic is not merely that the text books do not exist, but that so much of higher commercial or scientific education nowadays consists of special knowledge for which there are no Arabic terms. It is, therefore, extremely difficult to give that instruction as efficiently in Arabic as in some European language.

The progress of municipal government in Egypt will continue, but I cannot honestly say that I think Egypt is in a position in which we can realise the idea of representative self-government to the extent which the hon. Member for Brentford advocates. I think I have heard it said that no nation is capable of governing another, and that every nation is capable of governing itself. There is something else to be inferred from the hon. Member's speech—that though we are not capable of governing another nation, we are capable within a generation of teaching any nation in the world those arts of self-government which it has taken us several centuries to learn. I do not wish to discourage the ideal Lord Cromer has always put forward in his reports, that efforts should be constantly devoted towards training Egyptian officials to take a larger and larger part in the government of their country, towards the development of municipal institutions, and the general development of public spirit, and the qualifications of Egyptians for taking part in their own home government. But the art of government is one of the things which it takes longest to teach. You can teach almost every form of knowledge, but the art of government is something you cannot teach. If you go too fast to establish a country on a self-governing footing before the people have really acquired the necessary habits of mind and thought, before they are accustomed to feel that independence which enables them to protect their own interests under self-government, you may be sure the premature establishment of self-government will not be for the benefit of the lower and poorer classes; you will have set up prematurely a system under which those classes who only a few years ago were used to arbitrary rule will again be able to take advantage of the situation, and the premature withdrawal of British supervision and influence will again open the door to that corruption, oppression, and injustice which was the only form of government Egypt formerly knew.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I would ask if the right hon. Gentleman would press on the Egyptian Government that they should give the institutions founded by Lord Dufferin a fair trial, and the opportunity of doing good honest work?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The hon. Member means the Legislative Council. He will find in Lord Cromer's Reports that the Legislative Council has not been regarded with contempt. In what I have said I do not wish to discourage the ideal of self-government. I should be sorry if I have given that impression to the House; what I wanted to do was simply to press on the House that the hon. Member for Brentford had urged that the policy of self-government should proceed with far greater speed than is either safe or possible. But in doing so I do not wish to discourage the ultimate ideal of developing the habits of self-government in the people.

Now, Sir, I will pass from that to the Hague Conference. I will take the opportunity of congratulating the hon. Member for Knutsford on the interesting and able speech he made. It was, I believe, his first speech in the House, and it was made in a tone and manner agreeable to the whole House. I trust that his first experience of speaking in the House of Commons will be as agreeable to him as to those who listened to him. The hon. Gentleman expressed his disappointment with the results of the Hague Conference, especially on the question of armaments, and he was disappointed that the British delegates had not been instructed to make an appeal to the other Powers present at the Conference to take some active step with regard to the reduction of armaments. I cannot say what resolution may eventually be proposed at the Hague Conference, but if any resolution will be accepted by the delegates of the other Powers, the British delegates will be ready to propose it. If I cannot make any definite statement on the subject, it is because, after all the comments which have been made in the Press in Europe, in some quarters respecting the British proposal with regard to armaments, we are very reluctant to make any proposal at the Conference which might turn what is, and ought to be, a friendly Conference into one which was divided by controversy. But with regard to making an appeal to the other Powers to meet us on the subject of reduction of armaments, that appeal has been made emphatically and in the most public way by the Prime Minister. I supported it on at least one occasion in this House, and even if no definite results can be achieved at the Hague Conference, I trust that, at any rate, we shall have prevented the subject from dropping out of sight, and that the appeals which have been made to public opinion generally, though they may not have borne any direct result, may, at any rate, indirectly help forward the study of the question. I remain as impressed as I have ever been with what is almost the pathetic helplessness of mankind under the burden of armaments. It is an enormous burden on the great countries of the world, and it is natural that people should feel that if there were only the good will to discuss the matter with each other it ought to be possible to do something to reduce the burden. Yet they remain as helpless under the burden, apparently, as ever. Of course it is natural, in these circumsances, feeling how much might be done if the nations would only agree, and how little is done, that there should be strong pressure upon one nation to step out in advance and set an example. The difficulty in regard to one nation stepping out in advance of the others is this, that while there is a chance that their courageous action may lead to reform, there is also a chance that it may lead to martyrdom. We must proceed at such a pace as will carry the leading countries of the world with us. It was said that Germany has taken the lead in peace matters at the Hague Conference. [An HON. MEMBER: That was Stead's statement. It was a quotation.] I do not for a moment desire to derogate from or diminish the important part which has been taken by the German delegates; but I think, in justice to our delegates, what they have done should not be forgotten. The British delegates were the first to support the principle of a general arbitration treaty which was put forward by the United States. And here we see the objections to premature publicity. A general arbitration treaty to be effective should first of all receive considerable criticism. It is true that in regard to some points we had criticism when the proposal was first put forward, but that criticism was not for the purpose of disparaging the idea; and the final result is that we are all now in favour of a general arbitration treaty. But if it had not been for the premature publicity of details the impression would have been more favourable, because we should all have appeared simultaneously in support of a general arbitration treaty. The British delegates were also in favour of transferring the Hague tribunal into a permanent tribunal, so that it shall be a recognised body to which any nation can appeal; and also to improve the machinery of the *Commission d'enquete*, so that such incidents as the Dogger

Bank incident may come before it without any delay. All these things make for peace, and in all these things our delegates have taken a prominent and honourable part. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean raised the question of contraband of war. That question belongs to the department of work at the Hague Conference which relates not so much to the prevention of war as to making war when it has broken out less disagreeable and terrible. The abolition of contraband of war was part of a series of proposals which was made by us and others with the object of securing that, if unfortunately war should break out, it should be as little dangerous, as little inconvenient, as little disagreeable as possible to neutrals.

With regard to the Congo I have little to add to what has already been said. I entirely endorse the description of the state of affairs that exists there which has been given in the course of this debate. The quotations given by the hon. Member for South Monaghan, with which I am acquainted, relate to districts in which rubber is not produced, and therefore are not relevant to the charges made against the Administration of the Congo. The hon. Gentleman asked for proof of these charges. Surely the findings of the Commission and the constant reports of the British Consuls throw the burden of proof on the other side. A system of enforced labour exists, as everyone knows, in the Congo. The Congo administration justifies it under the name of a tax. It is called by others, who take a different view, slavery. If it is to be proved that it is not slavery the accounts of how the proceeds are spent must be published. If they are used for the purposes of private profit, instead of being employed solely for the benefit of the State, then this labour is not a tax, but slavery. I do not believe a system of that kind could live under the control of any Parliament in Europe. It rests with Belgium to exercise her right if she desires. I trust and hope that she will assume that responsibility, and assume it under conditions which will provide a remedy for the state of affairs. But as to pressing the matter forward, and until I know the actual conditions, it is impossible for me to make further statements on the matter. It is asked why I have been reticent. It is desirable, and only fair to Belgium, if she addresses herself to this great task, to leave her free to look at its merits after debates in Parliament, not complicated by introducing in them the idea that Belgium has to act under the menaces or threats from other parties.

In regard to Macedonia, I agree with hon. Members that our honour is engaged in that question. Our honour has been preserved because we cannot think that any country has taken a more active part either in the last year, or in previous years, in pushing forward reforms in Macedonia. I have been asked to prove that this country has taken the lead. I can only point to the Customs reforms and to the efforts of this country in securing, under stringent conditions, Macedonian reforms, in connection with Customs dues, to show that this country did take a leading part. But the persistent demand made in this connection is one which can only be prosecuted to the disadvantage of other nations. We wish to act with other nations; and I can only say that we shall continue to do our utmost to use our influence with other nations to promote reforms and a better state of things in Macedonia, and when there is a disposition shown to put forward measures with that object there will be no more warm supporters than ourselves. Part of the strength of our position in Europe arises from this fact, that we are regarded as desirous to keep the peace and not to trouble the peace of other nations. If you push matters with regard to Turkish or Macedonian affairs to such a length as to threaten a disturbance of the peace, by the fact of doing that your influence with your colleagues in the Concert will be much diminished. I do not point out that as in the least a vindication of the line we are to take. On the contrary, I am desirous to prosecute it by every means possible; but, at the same time, I have to remind you that the pace at which we can go in this matter is the pace which must be determined by the general sense of the Powers who compose the Concert. I have not time left to say much as to the Russian agreement. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of

Dean referred especially to certain Answers given in the House. He said that the Answers were very cautious. They were very cautious and also exceedingly accurate. Our object is to hold that all possible causes of quarrel, if possible, should be removed. That is an object, surely, to be pursued without reference to the internal affairs of a country. If the removal of possible causes of quarrel results in the development of friendship, the degree of that friendship must depend on public opinion. It may be in the power of the Foreign Office to remove possible causes of quarrel, but to say how far that removal strengthens friendship is not in the power of the Foreign Office; it rests with the people and with public influence in the countries. The right hon. Baronet said that I had managed to conduct affairs in the House with success and reserve. I think that we are as open and free with regard to information about foreign affairs in the House of Commons as any other Government in any other Parliament of Europe. I will always endeavour to give the utmost information in my power, but there are many difficulties in conducting the business of the Foreign Office and being in the House of Commons at the same time. I can only beg the indulgence and the confidence of the House without distinction of Party on either side, and I express the hope that it may be continued in order that I may do my utmost to prove that it is possible for the House of Commons to have a direct touch with the Foreign Office by having the Minister charged with foreign affairs among its Members.

Question put, and agreed to

And, it being Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to Standing Order No. 15, to put forthwith the Questions, That this House doth agree with the Committee in all the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of each Class of the Civil Services Estimates, the Navy Estimates, the Army Estimates, the Revenue Departments Estimates, and another outstanding Resolution.

CIVIL SERVICES ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS I.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class I. of the Civil Services Estimates," put and agreed to.

CLASS II.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class II. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 281; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 364.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig,Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)

Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone.Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks.G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murphy, N. J. (Kilkenny, S.)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willians
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger H. Y.
Stanley.Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir JohnL. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White,Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Ashley and Viscount Castlereagh,

CLASS III.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class III. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 277 ; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 365.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)

Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accringt'n)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.

Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas(W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A. H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H.(Somerset, E)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Ayes.—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Brotherton, Edward Allen

Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Ashton Manor)
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.

Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hervey, F. W. F.(Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)

Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.

Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Captain Faber and Sir John Randles.

CLASS IV.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class IV. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 278 ; Noes, 65. (Division List, No. 366.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.

Corbett,C.H. (Sussex,E.Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W.H. (St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)

Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson J.M.(Aberdeen W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Leese,Sir Joseph F. (Accringt'n
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold

Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Br'df'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Ayes —Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes —Mr. Evelyn Cecil and Mr. Arkwright.

CLASS V.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class V. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided:—Ayes, 278; Noes, 69. (Division List, No. 367.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston, S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W, H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs)
Mackarness, Frederick C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
K'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon)

Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Priestley, W.E.B. (BradfordE,)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh,N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wodehouse, Lord

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hon. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. HnWalter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale,: John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, W. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Major Anstruther-Gray.

CLASS VI.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VI. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided :—Ayes, 280 ; Noes, 68. (Division List, No. 368.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard

Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, RtHn.SirWBrampton

Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras, E.
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M(Falkirk B'gh s
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.

Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, SirW.D.(Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverhmpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, SirGScott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.

Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir. A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward, W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarth.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, SirGilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, AbelH. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell (Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir William Bull and Mr. Hicks Beach.

CLASS VII.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class VII. of the Civil Services Estimates."

The House divided: Ayes, 281; Noes, 68. (Division List, No. 369.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)

Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Dickinson, W.H.(St. Pancras, N.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L(Caithn'ss-sh.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles J.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh C. (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edingburgh, Central
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Br'df'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n

Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bannerman, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Brotherton and Captain Hervey.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Navy Estimates," put, and agreed to.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Army Estimates," put, and agreed to.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of the Revenue Departments Estimates," put, and agreed to.

EARL OF CROMER.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolution reported in respect of the Grant to the Earl of Cromer."

The House divided:—Ayes, 227; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 370.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Ashley, W. W.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry

Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Doulgas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Ferens, T. R.
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gretton, John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Rt. Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hervey, F.W.F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire

Kearley, Hudson E.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Liddell, Henry
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morpeth, Viscount
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel

Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rae, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthn
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wodehouse, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Bennett, E. N.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Fenwick, Charles
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph

Fullerton, Hugh
Glover, Thomas
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jordan, Jeremiah

Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
Maddison, Frederick
Mooney, J. J.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Snowden, P.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—
Mr. Arthur Henderson and
Mr. MacNeill.

WAYS AND MEANS [31ST JULY].

Resolution reported, "That, towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, the sum of £72,563,714 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Runciman.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

"To apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and eight, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (TONNAGE DEDUCTION FOR PROPELLING POWER) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :—

*MR. BRACE (Glamorganshire, S.) moved to leave out the word "fifty-five" and insert the word "thirty-five." The Committee, he said, would remember that when the Tonnage Bill was before the House on the 16th November last he moved a clause to the effect that the space occupied by propelling power should in no case exceed 40 per cent. of the gross tonnage. In the debate which took place the President of the Board of Trade had said that something ought to be done, but that nothing could be done that year because the question was almost an international one, and ought to be approached in a totally different manner next year. After that statement of his right hon. friend he had withdrawn the clause. Some time after that, the harbour authorities proceeded by private Bill to bring this matter before Parliament, and sought to have placed in their Bill a clause similar to that moved tonight which was also to apply to payment for pilots. The dock authorities were approached by the President of the Board of Trade, and were asked to withdraw the clause from their private Bill, and the right hon. Gentleman said he would bring in a Bill to meet the necessities of the case. The clause was withdrawn, and the right hon Gentleman brought in his Bill, after several conferences with the harbour authorities and dock authorities of the country. As a result of those conferences, the South Wales ports declined to be a party to the Bill, and the President of the Board of Trade arranged that this question should be submitted to a hybrid Committee, and the dock authorities and the pilots were to appear before that Committee to argue their grievances, presumably upon the basis that if they proved them the Committee would give them the relief which they sought. He was not quite sure his right hon. friend had carried out that undertaking. The right hon. Gentleman had himself given evidence before the Committee, and had brought such pressure as his strong personality enabled him to exercise to bear on the Committee, in order to induce them to resist giving to the South Wales ports and pilots the relief of which they were in need and which they desired. As a result of that, together with the pressure brought to bear by the Board of Trade, the Committee did not feel at liberty to make any Amendments in the Bill that was submitted for their consideration. He found that in regard to Clause 8 the Committee reported that, after weighing the evidence carefully, they had decided to retain the figure at 55 per cent., although a lower figure commended itself to some members of the Committee. He regretted the decision of the majority, and as the lower figure was suggested it must have been on account of the weight of evidence submitted, and the pity was that the majority could not be prevailed upon by the minority to accept the 35 per cent. figure in their Report. He felt that there had been no answer to the case presented before the Committee by the dock and harbour authorities and the pilots. Although this had been introduced as an enabling and relief Bill for the harbour authorities and the pilots, it left them in such a position that after this Bill was passed they would be precluded from coming before the Committees of Parliament with their cases. It was said that this Bill would settle the tonnage question for the pilots all through the kingdom. He wished to point out that this measure would preclude them from doing what they were entitled to do now, namely, to have their grievances heard before the Committees represented by counsel. The President of the Board of Trade had stated that this Bill would not prevent the dock authorities coming before the Committee for an alteration of their charges, but in fixing a uniform charge they would have to charge the people who were now paying what they considered was a fair and reasonable rate for the services rendered extra dues. He was fortified in the proposal he was making by the fact that a Royal Commission in 1880–81 recommended that the deduction for the space occupied by the propelling power should be 33 per cent. of the total, without any deductions for the crew or navigation space. That Commission recommended 33 per cent. of the gross tonnage. If he thought for a moment that the action he was taking would in any way prejudice the granting of sufficient crew space and accommodation he would not make this demand. He would give to the crew the 120 feet provided by the Merchant Shipping Act, or even 250 feet of crew space, but he thought the House ought to say where those deductions should stop so that the dock authorities and the pilots would not suffer through the ingenuity of shipbuilders and owners who had already been given considerably more deductions than they were entitled to receive. The arrangement suggested in the Bill was absolutely unfair. By all means make the deductions that were reasonable and necessary, but they ought not to give this bonus to shipowners at the expense of the dock authorities and pilots. Why could they not introduce in the shipping industry the principle of payment for services rendered which was in operation in every trade and industry in the country? The dock authorities and the pilots had been made to suffer all along the line, and he was proposing this 35 per cent. so that the authorities acting under the Board of Trade would know what allowance to make. This was by no means a small matter. This process of unfair deductions was going on all the time. The shipowners and shipbuilders for the purpose of saving as much bonus as possible were trying so to arrange their shipbuilding programme as to get these deductions. There was no protection at all for the dock authorities and the pilots against these practices. If the President of the Board of Trade would say that he would meet the claim of the dead-weight carrying ports by exempting them from the provisions of the Bill, he would support the measure without hesitation. It was not his desire to interfere with the arrangements which the President of the Board of Trade had made with those dock authorities who were satisfied with the Bill. By all means let them have what apparently met their case. He asked hon. Members not to pass the Bill, which would perpetuate a grievance which the right hon. Gentleman himself admitted in the House was an irresistible case. It was understood at first by those for whom he spoke that this was to be a relief Bill, but as a matter of fact it left them where they were, and, indeed, under certain circumstances they would be in a worse position. It was not sufficient to say that they should promote a Bill seeking an alteration in the rates. In that case the dock authorities would have to face the opposition of the shipowners, who were exceedingly strong in the House. The Amendment was in accordance with the minority Report of the Committee which sat under the presidency of the hon. Member for Dulwich when Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. It was also in accordance with a recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1881. Under the circumstances he thought he had presented a case which deserved consideration. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 8, to leave out the words 'fifty-five,' and insert the words 'thirty-five.'"—(*Mr. Brace.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. CORY (Cornwall, St. Ives), in supporting the Amendment, said the dock companies thought it would be a fair thing that steamers should pay on 60 per cent. of the gross tonnage as a minimum, which might make the average, say, 1 per cent. above what it was now. In the Bristol Channel at present it varied from 61 to 63 per cent., according to the dock. This would prevent the diminution in the minimum which was continually taking place. In 1880 in one of the Bristol Channel docks, Penarth Dock, the average rate of dues per ton shipped was 4·22, and in 1906 it had gone down to 2·32. In 1880 the ratio of net register to dead-weight was 65; in 1906 it had gone down to 44½. At the same dock in 1880 there were 3,168,965 tons shipped, on which they received in dock dues £47,696. In 1906 on 4,005,149 tons they received only £38,829. In other words the tonnage had increased about 850,000 tons and they actually received on this larger quantity about £9,000 less money in dues. In the meantime they had spent at this very dock over £300,000 to improve the shipping facilities, namely, new tips and hydraulic power, giving increased speed and extra tips. The average return from railways throughout the kingdom on £1,200,000,000, capital was less than 3½ per cent. The dividends from the docks were much less. The dock companies when combined with railways and designated under the title of "Dock Company" had changed to "Railway Company," because they found they could not get off their fresh issues of capital when called "Dock Company," owing to its being so commonly known that dock companies did not pay. Both the Bute Docks and the Barry Docks changed themselves into railway companies. Out of the £5,500,000 sunk in the Bute Docks, about £500,000 had been subscribed by the public. On the other hand the handsome dividends paid by steamers, particularly dead-weight tramp steamers, over a term of years, were at least 10 per cent., as compared with about 3½ per cent. on railways, and less on docks. He knew certain Members of this House were under the impression that dock companies paid very big dividends, and gave as a reason for this belief the fact that new docks were being built at heavy cost. But the dock companies had to build docks to meet the requirements of the larger steamers being built to keep their trade at all. He would state the returns on certain dead-weight docks. The Bute Docks paid 3 per cent., the Alexandra Dock, Newport, 2½ per cent., Port Talbot, 1½ per cent., and the Penarth Dock lost £20,000 per annum *qua* dock dues. The dock companies brought forward their private Bills asking for a minimum of 60 per cent. of the gross with a view to preventing the continual dwindling of their present average of 61 to 63 per cent. of the gross tonnage, which dwindling was brought about by the new ships being built from day to day. These private Bills the dock companies were induced to withdraw on a promise by the President of the Board of Trade that he would bring in a public Bill presumably to remedy their grievances.

The dock companies had already a minimum of 40 per cent., and the present Bill, which provided a deduction of not exceeding 55 per cent. for propelling power, after deducting crew and navigation space, which to-day averaged about 10 per cent. of the gross, only left 40·5 per cent. of the gross as the minimum instead of the 60 per cent. asked for, which in other words left the companies where they were. At Barry Docks, on a revenue from dock dues of between £50,000 and £60,000 a year, this Bill, if it had been in operation, would have produced only a few shillings extra revenue. At Penarth Dock on £39,000 a year, it would have given £2 2s. 7d. extra revenue. He mentioned just now that the crew and navigation spaces to-day averaged about 10 per cent. There was no limit to crew space, and it was contemplated by the Committee presided over by the hon. Member for Dulwich in 1905, that the crew and navigation spaces might be increased to 15 and even 20 per cent., which would reduce the percentage of the tonnage on which the dock companies could charge dues from 40·5 to 38·25 or even 36 per cent., of the gross tonnage. In order to give the dock companies the equivalent to 60 per cent. of the gross, the deduction for propelling space should be limited to 35 per cent. In the Report of the Royal Commission on Tonnage of 1881 it was recommended that the deduction for propelling space should not exceed 33 per cent of the total gross. This was precisely the equivalent to a deduction of the 35 per cent. of the balance of the gross, after deducting crew and navigation spaces on the lines of the present Bill. The Minority Report of the 1905 Committee recommended a deduction of not exceeding 40 per cent. of the balance of the gross. There would therefore appear to be no justification for forcing on the dock companies a Bill with a limit as high as 55 per cent. of the balance, instead of the 35 per cent. recommended in 1881, and the 40 per cent recommended in 1905. In the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, re-enacting the 1854 Act, it was provided that if the actual space occupied for propelling power was between 13 and 20 per cent. of the gross, the shipowner was entitled to deduct 32 per cent. The consequence was that steamers had been skilfully designed so as to come just over the 13 per cent. and so take advantage of the bonus up to 32 per cent. Over 90 per cent. of ordinary tramp steamers were designed so that the actual space for propelling power should be about 14 per cent. which gave them a bonus of 18 per cent. That bonus of 18 per cent. covered, it was true, the bunker space, but as the actual bunker space only occupied about 5 per cent. there was still a surplus bonus of 13 per cent. which came out of the pockets of the Dock companies and the pilots, as the registered tonnage was reduced to that extent. In 1854, when boilers and engines occupied so much more room and steamers burnt so much more coal, before compound, triple and quadruple expansion engines had been introduced—the spaces actually occupied by engines and bunkers might have amounted to 32 per cent. but they did not as a matter of fact. In these modern times with the improvement of boilers and engines, so much less space was occupied that there was no justification for continuing this fictitious allowance. This really was an indirect subsidy to the shipowner out of the pockets of the pilots and the dock companies. If the Government wanted to subsidise shipowners let them do it openly and out of the National Exchequer. In Belgium the actual space for propelling power plus the actual space occupied by bunkers together with other deductions similar to the English deductions were deducted from the gross in order to arrive at the register tonnage, and no fictitious bonus was allowed under Belgian rule. This, of course, applied to the important Port of Antwerp, which had enabled it to improve enormously the facilities of the port and seriously rival our home ports. One result of this legislation was that the pilots in his constituency were able to earn about 15s. a week. As an instance, a St. Ives pilot had to take his boat out into the bay to board the steamer, then pilot the steamer into Hayle—a very dangerous passage—and then walk home to St. Ives, a distance of five or six miles, for which he received the handsome remuneration of a few shillings, in some cases not more than 2s. or 3s. St. Ives pilots were renowned for their courage and their heroism. Many a time, when it had been impossible to launch the lifeboat owing to the heavy surf, the pilots, who owned very light gigs, had succeeded, in face of enormous difficulty and danger and at the risk of their lives, in launching their boats and rescuing the lives of many a crew who, but for their timely aid, would have met a watery grave. Further, the effect of this reduction of income had diminished the number of pilots and consequently had tended to impair the general efficiency of the pilotage service. Not the same class of men become pilots now owing to the low earnings. There were two ways in which the shipowner and naval architect sought to reduce the register tonnage on which dues were payable. The one was by reducing the gross tonnage, viz., by making water tanks either of the side description or the triangular type outside the main timbers and which were thus not included in the gross tonnage. These were used for water tanks, but really were of great value in adding to the buoyancy or flotation of the steamer and thus adding to her carrying capacity. In a deadweight cargo these could not be filled with cargo. The water tanks below the floor were also exempted from gross measurement. Spaces above the main deck which were covered in with open doorways and in which light cargo could be stowed were not included in the gross, and when the cargo was put in them they could close the doorways with planks or temporary doors. If they had fixed doors these spaces would be included in the gross tonnage. These covered-in spaces, although not included in the gross tonnage, and therefore reducing the register tonnage on which dues were payable, entailed extra expense on the dock companies because of the increased height of the cranes, tips, etc., necessitated by them. The Suez Canal measured these spaces in the gross tonnage. The second was by increasing the deductions from the gross tonnage. (1) By increasing the space for propelling power. (2) By increasing the space to an abnormal extent for the crew. This was done by labelling all odd spaces not required for cargo as crew spaces. The minimum space provided for under the Act of 1906 per man was 120 cubic feet, and was the space prescribed by the Board of Trade as sufficient for passengers; and yet certain owners with a view of increasing the deductions had allotted as much as 800 to 900 cubic feet per man. The Bill only proposed to deal with the deduction for propelling power. It did not deal with the grievance of the reduction of the gross tonnage, nor yet with the unlimited deduction for crew space. It was a common saying amongst shipbuilders and naval architects that the Board of Trade rules could be evaded. At the summer session of the institute of Naval Architects held in 1903 Mr. Napier said—

> "Their rules can be evaded. I think that in every shipyard you will find there is a Board of Trade rule-evading department. To show what can be done I may say there was a paddle steamer, the 'Ivanhoe,' built on the Clyde some years ago, purposely designed to have a negative net tonnage. This, however, went too far and necessitated one of the Harbour Authorities having to go to Parliament for an Act to authorise dues to be collected."

The dead weight ports proved that their dock dues which were charged on a register tonnage equivalent to from 80 per cent. to 90 per cent. of the gross have been continually reduced, and now amount to an average of about 63 per cent., which was still decreasing. All the harbours and the pilots in his constituency were opposed to the Bill, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to adopt his Amendment.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said that this Bill was practically a non-contentious one, and as far as it went at any rate, imposed no further reduction either on pilots or dockowners. The pilots of the United Kingdom, with the exception of the pilots and dockowners in the Bristol Channel, had accepted this Bill which was brought forward in the interest of the dockowners of the United Kingdom.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) dissented from the statement that all the pilots except those in the Bristol Channel accepted the Bill.

*MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that this was a Bill which, as far as it went, was in the interest of the dockowners, whether it went far enough was another question. It had been accepted after two or three conferences. His hon. friend had complained that he had not carried out his pledge, but all the pledge he gave was that he would support the Second Reading of this Bill, and he had satisfied all the dockowners in the kingdom except those owning three docks.

MR. BRACE said the right hon. Gentleman had not satisfied the dead weight carrying ports.

*MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said there were dead weight carrying ships in London and Liverpool, and he understood that the dockowners in those ports were prepared to accept this as a compromise. The docks in London to whom this was a matter of life and death were satisfied, as were also Liverpool, Glasgow, and Hull. Nine and a half millions of the 10,000,000 tons of shipping in this country were satisfied, and he had done his best to meet the shipping interest in the matter. As to pilots, the opposition was not got up by them, but by the docks. The hon. Member said they only paid 4 per cent., but their counsel said they were paying from 9 to 10 per cent. Here was a company that had issued its stock at a premium and it came and sued *in forma pauperis*, and wanted the House of Commons to put a little more on the shipping of the country in order that it might pay heavier dues. As regards the Bute Docks, his hon. friend knew the whole story better than he did and he was not going to say a word about it. What the Bute Docks paid the shareholders he did not know, but he did know that those who originally established the docks had been paid a hundred or a thousand fold. These were certainly not the docks which should come to the House of Commons to ask them to destroy a compromise in order that the dock companies might be able to get a higher dividend. They were doing very well already and there was no reason why they should be accorded special help. With regard to pilots, he was told that the dead-weight carriers did not employ pilots, and therefore whatever the House did it would not affect them.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham): Does the right hon. Gentleman say that the dead-weight carriers do not employ pilots?

*MR. LLOYD GEORGE said he was told that in the Bristol Channel ports the vessels affected by the Bill did not take in pilots. After all, however, the question of pilots was a very different matter from the one under consideration. He was perfectly certain that if that question was mixed up with the question of the docks the pilots would receive no relief. It meant that the whole of the shipping community of the country would be federated in fighting the cause of the docks. This was not the first time that this question had been brought up. It was considered two or three years ago. and a Committee appointed by the late Government reported that nothing ought to be done. He accepted the assurance of the hon. Member for Dulwich that he was prepared to accept the compromise, but that he was only prepared to accept the terms as a compromise. There was a clause in the Report of the Committee to which he had referred, dealing with the question of pilots. Some cases were brought before the Committee in which pilots were inadequately remunerated chiefly owing to the existence of unsatisfactory schedules of rates. This Bill had nothing to do with schedules of rates. The Committee thought that the Board of Trade might confer with the pilots with a view of devising some expeditious means of revising the rates without the necessity of the pilots coming to Parliament. That was a thing he was quite prepared to do. He was willing to accept the recommendation of the committee on the matter and he would be very glad to meet the pilots. But if he might give a friendly hint to the pilots he would tell them that they should not get mixed up with the dock companies. The pilotage service was a very dangerous service and very often led to loss of life. It was therefore a service which should be very adequately and fully remunerated. But the case of the pilots was very different from that of the dock companies, who wished to see their dividends of nine or ten per cent. made into fifteen per cent. Therefore as far as the pilots were concerned he was—as he had said—quite prepared to meet the recommendations of the Committee and to confer with them as to what could be done in regard to their rates, which according to the evidence produced were not what could be desired. He trusted that his hon. friend who had raised the question would consider that the statement he had made fully met the case of the pilots. There was another point that he wished to make. His hon. friend the Member for South Glamorgan had put the case of what he called the freak ships. There were a few of these ships in which the registered tonnage came to about thirty or forty per cent., and those cases would be covered by his Bill. Until this Bill was introduced there was no minimum at all. The result of the Bill would be to arrest the downward progress for the first time and he wanted the Committee to bear that in mind. He trusted that, having regard to the fact that the points in the Bill had been fully thrashed out and that they were simply endeavouring to put through an arrangement arrived at by all the parties connected with these great interests, the Committee would assist them in getting the Bill through.

SIR BRYNMOR JONES Swansea District) said he did not again propose to go over the arguments in favour of the Amendment proposed by his hon. friend the Member for South Glamorgan, but he desired to make one or two observations on the speech of his right hon. friend. From what he gathered his right hon. friend appeared to minimise the weight of the opposition to the proposal and this Bill which came from the Bristol Channel ports. The ports which he himself represented had made a representation to him that this Bill gave them no substantial relief whatsoever.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE: Swansea has a private Bill in which it asks for relief.

SIR BRYNMOR JONES said that Swansea was in a better position than the other ports it was true, but it was true also that the business of dock-owning in Swansea could hardly be carried on at a profit unless the reduced tonnage was not less than 60 per cent. of the gross tonnage. But he did not desire to raise this opposition so much in the case of Swansea as in the case of Port Talbot, where, the Committee would remember, a new dock had recently been opened. He asserted in the case of Port Talbot, as the result of representations which had been made to him, that unless some relief was given to them it was practically impossible that they should carry on the business of dock-owning at a reasonable rate of profit. He would point out that the coal exporting ports were in a very different position from the ports in the north of England, which did what might be called a general business. Where they had a coal exporting dock, it was undoubtedly the case that the appliances for the discharge or the loading of the coal into the ships were very expensive. These appliances had become better, and also more costly from year to year. It had been absolutely necessary for the competing ports in the Bristol Channel to make use of these improved appliances, and, on the other hand, the tendency for some time past had been to lower the registered tonnage on which the dock companies could charge their dues. Some of the ports had brought in private Bills, to which reference had already been made in the course of the discussion; but these Bills were not preceeded with, because an undertaking was given by the right hon. Gentlemen that some relief should be afforded in regard to these special cases. It seemed to him that what the right hon. Gentlemen was trying to do was to attempt to get an impossible formula. What was the object of the legislation? It was to provide that a reasonable remuneration should be paid to the dock-owners in respect of the services which they rendered to the ship-owners, and he believed that no one formula would meet the case. If 55 per cent. in general resulted in the remuneration paid to the dock-owners being a fair and just remuneration, he could not see why a clause should not be put in the Bill dealing with an exceptional case. It was quite easy to make an exceptional case of named ports, and he suggested that some such Amendment as that put down on the Paper by his hon. friend the member for South Glamorgan, which differentiated between the different classes of ships, should be adopted. He did not see why there should be one rigid rule for all kinds of ports in reference to all the different kinds of ships. He hoped that when they came to the Report stage his right hon. friend would be able to meet the fair and just claim he had advanced, namely, that exceptional treatment should be accorded to the Bristol Channel ports. With regard to pilots, his right hon. friend had suggested that where they were dealing with dead-weight ships no question of pilotage arose. His own information, however, was to a contrary effect. He had had a very strong representation made to him by the pilots in the port of Swansea and Port Talbot. He thought that in almost every case pilots had to be employed in those two ports, because they were ports the entrances of which were difficult and the navigation of which required great knowledge. Under all the circumstances he hoped his right hon. friend would on the Report stage accept some such Amendment as that to which he had referred.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor), who spoke as a member of the Committee which considered the matter, said that after the speech of the President of the Board of Trade it was not necessary to say much. He did not think it was the function of the Committee to review the whole question of methods of measurement. If anything of that kind was to be done he imagined the Government would appoint a Royal Commission, which would have on it some experienced men able to deal with that exceedingly difficult and complicated subject. Whether tonnage dues should be charged on merely gross measurement, or net measurement, or displacement or any other method, if there was another method, was a matter for a Commission to consider, and not for a Committee merely appointed to deal with provisions of a particular Bill. Quite apart from these considerations he thought it was just as well to remind the House that any drastic or fundamental alteration of the methods of measurement involved an international aspect of the question which could not easily be dealt with by a Committee of the House sitting to discuss a particular Bill's provisions. Then they were face to face with the general situation as presented by the President of the Board of Trade, which was that if the Bill or something very like it was not passed there would be no Bill at all. They could not largely amend that Bill without sacrificing the Bill altogether, and if they sacrificed the Bill altogether the dock owners would certainly be the worse, and in some cases the pilots would be the worse also. They must accept one of the two alternatives, that there was or was not to be a Bill, and nearly everybody, possibly quite everybody, would agree that some Bill ought to be passed. The next point was how far was the compromise contained in the Bill, which the Committee had endorsed, to be carried out. He must remind hon. Members, especially in South Wales, who had spoken on this point that the compromise was an extremely far-reaching one, and that it included such people as the Mersey Docks, who after all would have gained much, if not more than Penarth, under a reduction of 40 or 35 instead of 55 per cent. In the docks on the Mersey there was a large number of big passenger steamers which had large spaces for deductions for propelling power, and to that extent the Mersey Docks would be largely affected, but they had come into the compromise, which was a point that deserved careful attention, when they were considering the position taken up by the South Wales Docks. They were told by the mover of the Amendment that the evidence was all in favour of the reduction of 35 per cent. He could only say that he had heard a great deal of the evidence and had read practically all the rest, and that he could not agree with that conclusion. At the same time he was fully aware that a large portion of the evidence was in favour of reducing the 55 per cent. to some lower figure, but it was obvious that this should be, because, of course, the case that was being presented was on behalf of the Docks and pilots who desired that to be reduced, and therefore brought up a large mass of evidence all pointing in the direction of reducing the figure, whereas very much less evidence was heard in favour of maintaining the figure as it was. Such evidence, however, would no doubt have been very easily obtained if it was necessary; and if they had brought in a report to bring down the figure as low as 35 per cent. and the Bill had been wrecked the Committee would have been told that there were shipowners in large numbers who could have brought up a mass of evidence to show why the figure should be 60 per cent. The Committee did not have a large number of shipowning witnesses, but if they had had he was quite certain their evidence would have been quite as strong in favour of 60 per cent. as was the evidence of some other witnesses in favour of 40 per cent. If they were to have a Bill the question came back to the point that 55 per cent. was the figure which, after careful consideration, was agreed upon by all the interests concerned except a very limited number of their representatives, and that it was therefore the best figure to maintain if any Bill was to be passed. There was one other suggestion which was made by some witnesses in favour of altering the Bill. They said the Bill would not stop the building of a certain class of "freak" or "cheat" ships built on purpose to be able to claim large deductions for propelling and crew space and so escape tonnage charges. He did not profess to claim that it necessarily would, because from time immemorial engineers and ship builders had constantly directed their energies to getting over what regulations might exist. Shipowners, of course, wanted their ships built to pay as little as possible in dock and pilotage dues. Whatever regulations they might pass, naval architects would set about the very next morning devising means to overcome them. They were doing the best they could, however, to maintain a figure which met all interests, and that was all that could be expected of them. It had been suggested by the Member for Swansea that differentation might be made. They had had to deal with evidence upon that, and witnesses both in favour of maintaining 55 per cent and of reducing it were unanimously of opinion that it was not possible to differentiate properly between classes of ships. He himself asked the question whether they could make a 40 per cent. reduction of propelling space for passenger ships and 60 per cent. for cargo ships, or if there was any more convenient proportion. The witnesses always said it was not practicable; that a ship was not always clearly in the one class or in the other; that cargoes varied very much and passengers also. Sometimes they were half and half, passenger steamers and cargo steamers, sometimes they were both in a different proportion, and no end of litigation and trouble would arise if they attempted to differentiate in that way between the various classes of ships. He was glad the President of the Board of Trade had agreed to adopt paragraph 12, which concerned pilots, and was willing to consult as to what could be done. They would all be very glad to join him in trying to come to some arrangement which should put the matter in a better position. As regarded any grievances of certain docks the Committee had tried in their Report to provide for that in the final paragraph, in which they suggested a remedy by private Bill. He did not see very well what other remedy could be suggested if they adopted general legislation like this Bill. After having carefully reviewed the whole evidence and having discussed the matter amongst themselves thoroughly, and come to the conclusion that it was desirable to maintain the figure of 55 per cent., the only way grievances of individual docks could be met was by private Bill, and he hoped the Committee would follow the President of the Board of Trade and pass the Bill as it stood.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby), in supporting the Bill, urged the Committee not to accept the Amendment. He had been concerned in some of the negotiations on the matter, and representing as he did a portion of the port of Liverpool—the greater portion of the shipping part of that great centre of shipping—he said it would be very unfortunate if the Amendment were accepted. By so doing a compromise would be overthrown which he could assure the Committee it had taken immense labour to bring about. He was not, as his right hon. friend knew, often desirous of commending the virtues of either Front Bench to the House, but in this case he did think the President of the Board of Trade had been a wizard in bringing together many and diverse interests. It seemed impossible when the negotiations first began, seeing how great was the divergence between shipowners and dockowners, that an agreement would have been come to which would enable the Bill to be passed through during such a busy session as the present. He would only add that it would be wise for the Committee to support the Report of the Select Committee which sat to consider the matter. The hon. Member for South Glamorgan had said that the Committee decided against the weight of evidence. He thought that was an unusual thing to say of a Committee of that House, and it would be unfortunate if it were to be supposed on the mere *ipse dixit* of an hon. Member that a Select Committee decided against the evidence brought before it. Seeing that the

Committee decided by a majority of two to one to support that part of the Bill, and seeing that a very little part of the opposition was concerned with pilotage, and that in fact the whole of that opposition, as his right hon. friend pointed out, had now been met, it would be unfortunate for the Committee to throw over the decision of the Select Committee unless they had a very strong case against it. There was really no case against it. What the docks were now doing, as they frankly confessed, was, like Oliver Twist, asking for more. It was not that they had not got anything; they had got a great deal. He repeated that it would be unwise to disregard the decision of the Select Committee and overthrow a compromise gained by such laborious efforts.

MR. HOWELL DAVIES (Bristol, S.) said he would not have intervened in the debate had not the President of the Board of Trade said that the dock companies were quite satisfied. He was prepared to say that they went into that business with the desire to improve their position, and he quite agreed that the President of the Board of Trade had done everything he possibly could have done to settle the matter on satisfactory terms. He was one of the representatives of the dock companies present at the conference, and he was bound to say that while he was satisfied that they, as dock companies, got as much as they ought to have done, yet, at the same time, he was equally satisfied that in dealing with that very important question of charging net tonnage, if a public Bill was to be brought in it was impossible to satisfy everybody. Any less deduction than that agreed to would have been a heavy burden on the great passenger ships of this country, and therefore he was not able to press for any further deduction which they had asked for in introducing their Bristol Bill. In that Bill they provided for a deduction of 50 per cent. on the gross tonnage. If the South Wales ports were to get what they asked for through the Member for South Glamorgan it would make only a very little improvement in their condition. Those great Welsh ports, if they were to depend on their receipts being increased on reducing the deduction from 55 to 40 or 35 per cent., as suggested by the hon. Member, would only increase their revenue to an infinitesimal extent. He was perfectly satisfied that those great Welsh ports would have to look for some other method of raising their revenue than the net tonnage of ships. He had suggested several times that they had the remedy in their own hands, and that they could make the double charge in and out. They had only to combine in order successfully to increase their receipts. Those great Welsh ports now charged very much less than Bristol, or Liverpool, and Glasgow, and he was satisfied that they would never find the increase in revenue they desired by simply getting a further reduction in tonnage propelling power. He believed that for a public Bill that was as much as they could possibly get. It was quite within the power of any party to bring forward a private Bill, and if they could show good cause for getting more advantages, he was sure the House would give them. He hoped that under the circumstances the Member for South Glamorgan would now withdraw his Amendment, for the opinion of the House was that in a public Bill they could not suit the special circumstances of every particular party.

MR. JOYCE desired to correct an impression which the House might have formed from the speech of the President of the Board of Trade. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the pilots in opposition to the Bill were only the pilots in the Bristol Channel. He was wrong. When the Bill was before the Committee upstairs he had received a resolution from Barrow-in-Furness, where the annual conference of the pilots of the United Kingdom was taking place, condemning the Bill in the matter of the 55 per cent. deduction and asking leave to oppose it. He would not like the pilots to be brought between the two millstones, the shipowners on the one hand, and the dockowners on the other, and perhaps ground out of existence. He did not think the pilots would be such fools as to allow themselves to be made tools of by any dock authority. The pilots had such a good case that they had no occasion to look for any outside help in the matter. There was an impression that the dead-weight ships did not take pilots in the Bristol Channel. That was incorrect; they did. The only vessels he knew where pilotage was not compulsory were where pilotage was so easy that the master could do it himself. That was only the case with the small coasting vessels. He did not intend to delay the Committee, for he had heard so much of that Bill in the last few months that he had had quite enough of it. The Committee which considered it heard a mass of evidence and approached the matter in a perfectly fair spirit. He, as a member of that Committee, had not a word to say against any member from the Chairman downwards. They all got perfectly fair play and plenty of latitude for the points discussed. He was sure the pilots of the United Kingdom would be thankful to the President of the Board of Trade for the way he had met their claim that night. He accepted the promise which the right hon. Gentleman had given unreservedly, and he hoped that in the course of next year everything would be arranged between the representatives of the pilots of the United Kingdom and the Board of Trade, and that some legislation would be the outcome which would place the pilots in the position in which they ought to be. Everybody knew what their views were and what their calling was. Every pilot knew that the success of the shipowner meant the success of the pilot. The pilot and the shipowner must always work hand in hand, and when the shipowning community of the United Kingdom was doing good trade the pilots would benefit. They had no desire to see the shipowners and the pilots set at loggerheads.

MR. LLEWELYN WILLIAMS (Carmarthen District) said he did not propose to trespass on the Committee for more than a few moments. His right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade had exercised a wizardy over that Committee in the same way as he did at the Conference. He knew that any thing he might say would not alter the right hon. Gentleman's attitude towards that Bill now. He wished, however, to say a word or two on behalf of his constituents who were rather differently placed from those in any other constituency in South Wales. Unfortunately the local authority there was the owner of the dock. It was not a dock where millions of money had been sunk, and it was not one of those docks which had earned 8 per cent. revenue. If the dangers they feared from that Bill were to occur the condition of the local authority owning the dock would be very bad indeed. The difficulty that dockowners had was that during the last fifty years the deductions had been increasing year by year until at present they were paid on something like 61 per cent. of the gross tonnage. It might be, and they feared it would be, that after that Bill had been passed the deduction would bring it down to something like 40 per cent. They had a private Bill in 1894 giving them power to charge on a minimum of 50 per cent. of the gross tonnage. The same thing applied to the port of Swansea, and all that he was anxious for was that they should be absolutely certain that the powers given to them in their private Act should not be overridden by that Bill. At all events, they desired an assurance that the powers they had of charging on a minimum of 50 per cent. should not be diminished by anything in the Bill. They were deeply interested in the matter, and he appealed to his right hon. friend to give them the assurance they wanted. He took it that his right hon. friend quite saw the force of his observations, but, he saw nothing in the Bill which gave them the safeguard which would make it quite clear that their powers would not be interfered with. Would not his right hon. friend promise to adopt the Amendment of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil? It was the last on the Paper, and as he did not propose to stay till the last Amendment was reached he asked the question at this stage.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought he might be permitted to answer his hon. friend at once. His hon. friend wanted to be assured that the Bill would not interfere with any protection he had got. He had already given an assurance to the hon. Member for South Glamorgan that the Bill would not affect the cases that had been mentioned at all, and if there was any doubt on the point he would make it quite clear that the Irish ports, and the ports which had been specially referred to by hon. Members, should be protected. He trusted, after that explanation, that his hon. friend would see his way to withdraw.

MR. BRACE said that after the explanation of his right hon. friend with regard to the pilots; which he accepted and with the hope that something would be done to meet the points he had ventured to put to him on behalf of the Dock and Harbour Authorities of South Wales between now and the Third Reading of the Bill he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he did not wish to delay the Committee at that late hour, but, still, he thought that it was right for them to do what they could to assist those authorities with whom they were connected. He had no financial interest in any dock companies, or in any shipowning firm, and all he was concerned about was to see that justice was done. The real question was whether fifty-five or thirty-five per cent. was the fair percentage to take. Speaking with some actual practical experience in the matter, he was bound to say that thirty-five per cent. was much nearer what was right and proper than fifty-five per cent. He was not prepared to vote for fifty-five per cent. that night. He did not deny that that was a compromise; he admitted in fact freely that it would improve their position, but what he complained of before, and must complain of again that night was that the right hon. Gentleman should have said that he had consulted all the authorities when he knew perfectly well that he had not consulted the Thames Conservancy at all. Of course the right hon. Gentleman might sneer at his humble efforts to assist any public body to which he might belong, or even at times to assist him, but he did not mind those sneers. If there was one body which should have been consulted, in his opinion, it was the Thames Conservancy, because that body made no money out of it, every penny they got from tonnage dues being spent on improving the water-way for the use of the ships. They had but little other income of any kind but those tonage dues; therefore, to ignore a body like that was not a fair and proper thing to do, neither was it right to laugh at it. He dared say they would be able to get on notwithstanding that Bill, but he would have been better pleased to have seen the matter settled if they could have got the Government to accept thirty-five per cent., for it would have been nearer a final settlement, and a fairer settlement. All that body to which he belonged wanted was that they should have what was fair, the payment of tonnage dues on the actual net tonnage. He was not going to oppose the Bill that night if the President of the Board of Trade would stick to the verdict of the Committee. Having sent the Bill to a Committee, and got their verdict, he thought that it ought at that time of the session to be complied with. The next time there was any conference of that sort, and a statement was made that all the authorities had been consulted, he hoped they would all have in fact been consulted.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, to leave out the word 'registered' and insert the word 'register.'"

"In page 1, line 17, to leave out the word 'registered' and insert the word register.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'July' and insert the word 'January.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. JOYCE said that this related to an Amendment made in the Bill by the Committee upstairs cutting down the limit for freak ships from seven years to three years. That was the result of a compromise arrived at outside the Committee after a great deal of talk and some opposition. The compromise was offered by the Chairman of the Committee, and was accepted by all the Members present except one. In the Committee they also had a controversy in regard to what were called freak ships. He felt on the evidence which they had before them, if those ships were cheat ships, the sooner they shortened the time given to them to remain freak ships or cheat ships the better. That was his reason for opposing the Amendment, which brought them back to the original seven years. He was a party to the compromise on the Committee and he did not think he could be a party now to allowing the matter to pass without stating his opposition to the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'ten,' and insert the word 'fourteen.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

*Mr. MORTON complained that the Amendment had been moved without a word of explanation. As far as he understood the Amendment it meant that with a view to enlisting the support of the shipowners, the new measurement was not to come in force for seven years, and if no alteration was made it would come into force in three years. It practically meant, therefore, that this Act, for whatever it was worth, would not come into operation in the case of the main part of the ships for seven years. He was quite aware that the President of the Board of Trade told them when the Bill was sent up to the Committee that he had made some arrangement with the shipowners in regard to the 55 per cent., but he said nothing about this seven years waiting so far as existing ships were concerned. The Bill was sent to a hybrid Committee with, as he hoped and understood, the intention that some notice would be taken of what the Committee did. Now they were told that despite what the Committee decided, after full consideration of the matter, the President of the Board of Trade was going to insist upon the Bill being carried into law just in the same way as if it had never been submitted to the Committee at all. That was not fair to the Committee, nor, in his opinion, was it fair that they should have to wait seven years before they got the full benefit of the Bill. He trusted that at least they would have some explanation why this was to be done. If they waited for three years before the Bill came into operation to any large extent that ought to be sufficient.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had no objection to making an explanation on the point. It was true that a very able and a very excellent Committee went fully into the matter. The fact was, however, that it was difficult to carry out an arrangement arrived at and agreed to by all the owners of ships. This was purely a matter of bargain, and he thought the dock owners got far and away the better of the bargain. The dock owners saw it and they were prepared to stand by it. But still, seeing that the dock owners would have that 5 per cent., he felt more or less bound to ask the Committee to stand by the other part of the bargain as well.

MR. JENKINS hoped that the President of the Board of Trade would not accept the Committee's recommendation in this respect. The right hon Gentleman said that the bargain was made with the dock authorities, excluding, of course, the Bristol Channel ports. That was so. The President of the Board of Trade willingly accepted the recommendation that the Bill should go before a Special Committee. The Committee sat for twelve days and took a large amount of evidence. He was inclined to think that that was simply a farce. The President himself gave evidence before the Committee, and when the question was put to him, what would be the effect if alterations were made in the Bill, he said the House would not pass it. Now they had it that when the Committee was discussing the Bill it was wasting its time, because the President had given a promise to the dock owners. He exceedingly regretted that. It was prospective legislation with a vengeance. In seven years from now Members of that House might be far enough away, and other people might come in and tear down all the work that had been done. If there was a grievance as to dock charges, why should the Bill not come into early operation? The Committee were not unanimous on every subject, but they were upon that. He regretted the circumstances which compelled the President to say he could not accept the Committee's recommendation on that respect.

MR. HILLS (Durham) thought that seven years was a reasonable time and not at all excessive. He had opposed the reduction to three years because he thought three years were too short. Ships now on the stocks would hardly be built in three years and they were planned on the old system. Reasonable and fair notice must be given in making such a change.

*MR. MORTON said he did not propose to go to a division, but he was not at all satisfied with the explanation of the President of the Board of Trade. If Ministers were to make bargains with people behind the back of the House and then come and say they did not care what the Committee's decision was after hearing evidence and considering the matter, that was not the proper way to carry on the business of the country.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. CORY moved to insert the following new Clause: "This Act shall not apply to any port or harbour on the Bristol Channel other than Bristol."

* MR. LLOYD-GEORGE hoped his worthy friend would not press the Amendment. They could not make an exception in favour of one creek or estuary. The general law must apply.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered this day.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*,)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at ten minutes after One o clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 2nd August, 1907.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Imported Watch-cases.
2. Territorial and Reserve Forces.
3. Telegraph (Money).
4. Australian States Constitution.
5. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1).
6. Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3).
7. Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation.
8. Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation.
9. Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1).
10. Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2).
11. Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 3).
12. Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3).
13. Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4).
14. Tramways Orders Confirmation.
15. Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks.
16. Sheffield Corporation.
17. Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation).
18. Tynemouth Corporation (Water).
19. Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways.
20. Humber Conservancy.
21. North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply.
22. Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply.
23. Sunderland Corporation.
24. Coventry Corporation.
25. Manchester Corporation Tramways.
26. North British Railway.
27. Tees Conservancy.
28. Annfield Plain and District Gas.
29. Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation.
30. South Wales Mineral Railway.
31. Pasley Children Legitimisation.

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL.

Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1^a; to be printed; and to be read 2^a on Tuesday next: (The Lord President [*E. Crewe*]). (No. 148.)

MERCHANT SHIPPING (TONNAGE DEDUCTION FOR PROPELLING POWER) BILL.

Brought from the Commons, read 1^a, and to be printed. (No. 149.)

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 2nd August, 1907.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

John Muldoon, esquire, for the county of Wicklow (East Wicklow Division).

COMMISSION.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills. (See page 1373.)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Aberdeen Corporation Electricity Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Midland Railway Bill [Lords] (King's consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Portishead District Water Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.

Petition from Stroud and Mid-Gloucester, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Reading, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirkcudbright, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST-DAY BILL.

Petition from Tooting Junction and other places, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 9) Warrant, dated 19th July, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (HUMAN AND BOVINE) (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Appendix, Part II. (two volumes), to the Second Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of Human and Animal Tuberculosis [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF STAFFORD).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Stafford altering the Handsworth Sandwell (South) Polling District of the Handsworth Parliamentary Division of Staffordshire [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Memorandum on the Teaching of Drawing [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report No. 532 (Surveys of British Africa, Annual Report of the Colonial Survey Committee, Second Year, to July, 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—SUPREME COURT (RULES).

Copy of Rules of the Supreme Court, dated 3rd August, 1907 [by Act].

VALUATION OF LANDS (SCOTLAND) ACT.

Copy ordered, "of the Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Act, 1854, and of amending Acts."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 284.]

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT, 1906-7.

Return ordered, "showing, in respect of the financial year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, the distribution of the moneys paid into the Local Taxation Account in pursuance of the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1888, the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, the Finance Act, 1894, and other Acts (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 351, of Session 1906)."—(*Dr. Macnamara.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Plastering Contracts at New Post Office Buildings, Carter Lane.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the plastering work at the new offices in Carter Lane has been sub-let by the contractor; if so, has this been done with his sanction; and for what reason and why was not the plastering, if necessarily executed by another contractor, separately tendered for, as was done for such work at the War Office, Home Office, and Victoria and Albert Museum.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I am informed by the contractor that the plastering work has not been sub-let.

Conveyance of Mails to the East.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Postmaster-General, assuming the total charge for the conveyance of British mails to Shanghai to be 4s. 3d. per lb. by French packet and 4s. 10d. per lb. by German packet, what proportion of each charge is represented by the cost of conveyance from London to Brindisi; and whether he can assign any reason for the difference in the charges.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The mails in question are not conveyed by way of Brindisi. Those conveyed by French packet are embarked at Marseilles, and those conveyed by German packet are embarked at Naples. The cost of the conveyance through France to Marseilles is about 7d. per lb., and that of the conveyance through France and Italy to Naples is about 1s. 2d. per lb.

MR. HAROLD COX: To ask the Postmaster-General whether any British mails are sent to London from Hong Kong via the Trans-Siberian Railway; if so, what is the time taken in transmission; and, if not, what would be the time on the assumption that the time taken from Shanghai to London is twenty days.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No direct mails are sent to London from Hong Kong by the Trans-Siberian route, but correspondence from that Colony arrives in the mails from Shanghai. The usual time of transit from Hong Kong to Shanghai is about three days; and the transit from Hong Kong to London by way of Shanghai and the Trans-Siberian Railway would thus be about twenty-three days, if no break occurred in the connection.

MR. HAROLD COX: To ask the Postmaster-General what is the packet company which is responsible for the conveyance of letters from this country to Shanghai via Vancouver; what is the total subsidy paid to this company, and what is the total number of pounds of letters carried per annum to all destinations comprised within the terms of the contract; and whether the company performs any other services in return for the subsidy paid to it.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The mail service from this country to Shanghai via Vancouver is performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The subsidy paid to the company is £60,000 per annum, which covers the conveyance of mails by rail across Canada as well as the conveyance by sea across the Atlantic and the Pacific. The weight of correspondence sent in mails made up in this country and conveyed to Japan and China during the year 1906 by this service was 187,100 pounds, as stated in the reply to the hon. Member's Question of 23rd March last. The weight of mails since the new subsidised boats began to run shows a very large and substantial increase. In addition the company conveyed (*a*) mails exchanged with Canada, (*b*) mails from Japan and China for the United Kingdom, and (*c*) certain mails from and for the Continent of Europe. The company also conveyed parcel mails. The weight of these mails is not recorded. In addition to the mail service the company undertakes the conveyance of Government passengers and stores and is under special obligations in regard to the sale or hire of ships of the Crown. The hon. Member will find the particulars of these responsibilities set out in

Clauses 34, 35, 36, and 37 of the contract.

MR. HAROLD COX: To ask the Postmaster-General what is the packet company that conveys letters from this country to Hong Kong via Suez; what is the total subsidy paid to this company, and what is the total number of pounds of letters carried per annum to all destinations comprised within the terms of the contract; and whether the company performs any other services in return for the subsidy paid to it.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The hon. Member presumably refers to the British packet service, which is performed by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company. The total subsidy at present paid to the company is £340,000 per annum. Under the new contract which has just been signed this will be reduced to £305,000. The total weight of the correspondence contained in the letter mails conveyed by the company on behalf of the United Kingdom to all destinations, and on behalf of India and British Colonies to the United Kingdom, in 1906 was 6,865,000 pounds. The weight of foreign mails and of intermediate Colonial mails conveyed by the company at the present time cannot be stated, as the statistics on which payment to this office for the conveyance of these mails is based are taken at long intervals only. The contract with the company provides not only for a mail service to Hong Kong with extension to Shanghai, but for services to India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, and Australia. The company conveys parcel mails as well as letter mails, and is under certain obligations regarding the conveyance of Government passengers and stores and the sale of their ships to the Government.

Sentences of Death.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of persons sentenced to death for murder in England, Wales, and Scotland, respectively, during the past eighteen months; in how many of such cases has application been subsequently made to the Home Office; and in how many of such cases has the death sentence been remitted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The figures are given below. Those for 1907 include only persons sentenced up to 30th June. The Scottish figures were obtained from the Secretary for Scotland, who advises on the exercise of the prerogative in Scottish cases.

	Number sentenced to death.	Number of cases in which application has been made to the Home Office.	Number respited.
England, 1906 - -	27	23	18
„ 1907† - -	9	8	6
Wales, 1906 -	None	None	None
„ 1907† -			
Scotland, 1906 - -	None	None	None
„ 1907† - -	1	1	1

† To end of June, 1907.

Holidays of Trinidad Labourers.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state what are the legal holidays mentioned in the contract to which Trinidad labourers indentured on the Panama Canal are entitled; and what provision exists for ensuring that such holidays are duly granted.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) At the present I can only refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave to a similar Question on the 25th of July, as I am still unable to give the information asked for.† I understand, however, that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is making inquiries on the subject of the holidays granted to the labourers.

Female French Polishers in Dockyards.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether there are any females employed in the Government dockyards at the work of French polishing; if so, how many, and what are the wages, hours, and conditions of employment; whether female has displaced male labour at this work; and, if so, for what reason.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The experiment of employing women on this work was introduced at Devonport dockyard in the year 1904. Four women are employed at wages varying from 16s. to 17s. a week. I am informed that the experiment was made in imitation of the practice in the private trade.

Scottish Land Valuation Laws.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will issue to the members of the Scottish Grand Committee, before it meets to consider the Land Values (Scotland) Bill, a White Paper containing the Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854, with the amending Acts, showing their application to the Land Values (Scotland) Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) It appears that the Valuation Act, 1854, is out of print. I am arranging for a reprint of that Act, and hope that this will meet the hon. Member's wishes.

Scheme for Division of Castlecaldwell Lands, County Fermanagh.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have made any arrangements to divide the demesne lands of Castlecaldwell, on the Bloomfield estate, county Fermanagh amongst neighbouring tenants; whether any scheme for division has been put forward by the parish priest; and will due regard be paid to the needs of Protestant small tenants, or any provision be made for providing evicted tenants in the district with new holdings on the untenanted lands of this demesne.

(*Answered by Mr Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners' inspector has inspected a portion of the lands referred to with a view to their being allotted amongst evicted tenants and the occupiers of small holdings, in the event of a sale to the Commissioners. The Commissioners are not aware that any scheme of division has been put forward by the parish priest. If the Commissioners should acquire the property they will, in allotting the land, pay due regard to the wants and circumstances of the tenants of small holdings irrespective of their religious belief, as to which no inquiry is made.

Junior Assistant Mistresses in Schools with Attendance below Fifty.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in schools where junior assistant mistresses were appointed they will be retained if the average attendance for the calendar year ending 31st December, 1907, be over fifty.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the answer is in the affirmative, but they add that in schools in which the average attendance is fifty or upwards it is desirable that a female assistant teacher, as distinct from a junior assistant mistress, should be employed.

Untenanted Land at Drumraney

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will call the attention of the Estates Commissioners for Ireland to the fact that there is a quantity of untenanted land in the vicinity of Drumraney, county Westmeath, which the owners are willing to sell and the neighbouring people most anxious to buy; and if he will advise the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxix., 129-130.

Commissioners to have the said lands inspected with a view to purchase at the earliest possible date.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are not aware to what particular lands the Question refers. If the hon. Baronet will furnish the names of the owners, the Commissioners will consider the question of communicating with them with a view to purchase the lands, if this has not already been done.

Female French Polishers at Ordnance Factories.

MR. O'GRADY: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether there are any females employed at French polishing in any of the workshops or factories under his Department; if so, how many; what are the wages, hours, and conditions of employment; whether female has displaced male labour at this work; and, if so, for what reason.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No females are employed at French polishing in the ordnance factories.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House do, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till Monday next.—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 285.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 285.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 300.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection that they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Sir Randal Cremer; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Nicholls.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Thomas Frederick Richards, Mr. Hugh Law, and Sir Randal Cremer; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Curran, Mr. John O'Connor, and Mr. Nicholls.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Mond; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. George White.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (added in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Agnew; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Alexander Harvey.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Rainy; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Mr. Lupton.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C: Mr. Cave, Mr. George Faber, and Mr. Gretton; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Long, Earl Percy, and Mr. Abel Smith.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said it might be considered that he ought to suffer a certain amount of compunction in venturing to suggest the rejection of a measure which had been brought into the House under the patronage of the Chief Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman had already brought in two measures, both of which had met with an ignominious result, while one had been summarily rejected by those whom it was intended to benefit. Perhaps he might be justified in directing attention to an anology between the death of the Irish Council Bill and the birth of the present Bill, when he read the resolution passed by the United Irish League a week before the measure was brought into the House of Commons. That resolution was as follows—

> "That, recognising the failure of the Land Act of 1903 to satisfactorily settle the question of evicted tenants, this meeting of the National Directory strongly impresses on the Government the desirability of pressing forward with the greatest possible despatch the Bill for the compulsory reinstatement of a class in Ireland which has suffered and lost so much in the effort to alter a system of land tenure in this country which has justly merited universal condemnation. We are strongly of opinion that any measure enacted for this desirable end should give full power to the Estates Commissioners to fix the price of land compulsorily acquired for that purpose."

He thought they could draw a very decided analogy between the words of that resolution and the object of the Bill which he was endeavouring to induce hon. Members to assist him in rejecting. He took the novel and unusual course of moving the entire rejection of a measure with the object of which he was entirely in sympathy, because he maintained that in view of the manner in which the Bill was carried out and of the compulsory powers it contained, the Government were taking an entirely unjustifiable course. He did not propose to go into the details of the measure but to confine himself to the broad principles which he maintained were of such an injurious character that they should have been most carefully considered. He sincerely hoped that even those hon. Gentlemen who had made up their minds on the question already would give him the indulgence of listening to the remarks he put forward against the Bill. It might be said that the matter had already been discussed *ad nauseam*. He did not agree with that assertion. He did not think they had had an opportunity of adequately discussing the Bill, and even if they had had such opportunity they would be merely following the lead of the Nationalists, who, with one object in view, pursued it repeatedly, emphatically, and relentlessly. He proposed to do exactly the same in regard to this Bill. He thought it would be admitted that by reason of the closure which had been applied they had been unable to have that unfettered and free discussion of the Bill which was so essential for any measure and most essential for such a measure as this, which was professedly in the interests of all classes of the community at large. He maintained, however, that it was of such an unjustifiable character that they should have had an opportunity of discussing it at greater length. He did not propose to enter into the details of the Bill, nor should he be in order in speaking of the closure; but he ventured to say that this measure had been more deleteriously affected by the action of the closure than perhaps any other measure. This weapon of oppression in the hands of the Governments if continually made use of was bound sooner or later to vitiate and check if not entirely arrest the most useful work in which for centuries past the House had been engaged. He could not believe that anyone in the House could affirm that the course of the Bill had been of a peaceful character, and he did not know that anybody could claim that the Government entirely adopted that spirit of conciliation which was absolutely necessary for a peaceful settlement on the lines which they desired. He wished to say a few words in regard to his own attitude on this Bill. He said without hesitation that he was entirely in favour of reinstating the evicted tenants where possible, but he maintained that that should only be carried out in an amicable and peaceful manner, and care should be taken that the tenant who was replaced should be restored in such a position that he would always be able to make an economic success of his holding. He would say certainly let all evicted tenants be reinstated and let bygones be bygones. This should be brought about if it could be done in any measure at all without any injustice to any section of the community in Ireland. The action of the Bill would bring about injustice to a certain class of the community who were not, in the circumstances of the case, deserving of being oppressed. He had no bitter feeling whatever against the evicted tenants; on the contrary, he had a feeling of compassion for those who had been led away and wilfully deceived by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway or their predecessors into refusing to pay their rents to their lawful landlords, and to paying them instead into the coffers of the Plan of Campaign. It was necessary, however, in this world that we should all pay more or less for the follies we committed; still he had compassion for those evicted tenants who had relinquished their holdings in the manner described. It was for this reason, where injustice could be avoided, that he was prepared to support the reinstatement of these tenants in their own holdings or any other holdings acquired for that purpose. But the views of those with whom he was associated, and of hon. Members below the gangway, as to the manner in which the reinstatement was to be effected, were, he believed, almost diametrically opposed. Hon. Gentlemen would credit him with a desire for a settlement of the question, but he protested against this Bill which had been forced through the House of Commons with the aid of an unwieldy majority, most of whom had a minimum of knowledge of Irish affairs, and whose desire for Home Rule emanated from a preference for the room of the hon. Gentlemen below the gangway to their company in the House of Commons, and who looked on the Committee and Report stages of the Bill with pleasure as a means of materially adding to the number of divisions they had attended; a valuable proof to their constituents of industry in the House of Commons. He thought the Bill was unnecessary, because the principle which it affected was being expeditiously carried out under the Land Act of 1903. The Report of the Estates Commissioners showed that in the three years which had elapsed since the Act was brought into force 1,000 evicted tenants had been reinstated in their holdings. In support of his contention that the Bill was unnecessary, he would refer to an authority that he knew would obtain weight in the House. He referred to the late Chief Secretary, Mr. Bryce, who said on 29th October last year—

> "He entirely denied that it could be fairly said that the Act had failed in dealing with the evicted tenants. He did not think that the progress made had been inconsiderable, considering the difficulties which surrounded the question."

That was a very important statement and a most decided justification of the view he put forward, that the Bill was of an entirely unnecessary character. He was convinced that what might be gained in additional expedition in reinstating these evicted tenants would be lost in the postponement for a generation, if not for a longer period, of that amicable settlement of affairs in Ireland which they all desired. He now came to the main objection to the Bill, viz., the principle of compulsion, which was a direct departure from all preconceived ideas of justice and equity—of justice between man and man—and a direct infringement of the rights and liberties of the people. The analogy of acquiring land compulsorily for railway purposes was often cited, but he did not agree with it at all. The two purposes for which the land was to be compulsorily acquired were entirely different. A railway benefited a large section of the community, but in this Bill it was proposed to take land from one man and give it to another; it was proposed to evict one man from his farm simply for the purpose of putting another in his place. He maintained that this system was fraught with great danger to the rights and liberties of the individual and would have a far-reaching effect which the Government did not at the present moment contemplate. He believed that once compulsory power was given it would be extended to various matters which were not in the minds of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. Compulsion was the backbone of the Bill, and that was the reason why he ventured to move its rejection. The evicted tenant had emerged from the debates, so far as hon. Gentlemen below the gangway were concerned, as a sort of hero. He had been put forward as a man not sinning but as one who had been grievously sinned against, a man who had been summarily evicted at the whim of a capricious landlord. But they knew that the evicted tenant had been deprived of his holding for very good reasons, either because he was unable to pay his rent or had wilfully refused to pay the rent he had undertaken to pay, thus breaking the obligations into which he had entered. Under the Bill the evicted tenants were placed in the position of a privileged class, and were under no circumstances to be considered responsible for their misdeeds. The evicted tenant was to be replaced, if possible, in his original holding, and, if he mistook not, his arrears of rent were entirely ignored, while his debts were to be borne by someone else. All this was to be accomplished by ignoring the tenant who was called a "planter," who had nothing whatsoever against him except that he might be unpopular with a certain section of the friends of the lawbreakers. The planter had emerged from the debates as a man for whom no punishment was too severe—a man who, for his own pleasure, had assumed possession of a farm rightfully belonging to someone else, and was content to remain in it for the express purpose of annoying the evicted tenant. What were the real facts? The planter might have been in possession of his holding for twenty-five years. He might be a tenant; he might be an owner; he might have bought the land, and the circumstances might be such as to make it very harsh and hard to take him away from it. It was proposed under the Bill to reinstate the evicted tenants. There was nothing against the planter except, perhaps, that he had refused to be terrorised by the friends of the evicted tenant. He had perhaps gone so far as to ignore boycotting and other reprehensible devices which were brought about at the instigation of the agitators who professed to rule Ireland. He was for this purpose to be dispossessed of his holding and transferred to another part of the country; in a word, he was told that he had to begin life over again. That was the avowed object of the whole thing, and he asked hon. Gentlemen opposite did they, for one moment, believe that a system of that kind could possibly settle the condition of affairs in Ireland? What guarantee had they against further hostilities or that these unfortunate individuals who had been removed from their holdings would not again be required to move away? He maintained that this was no solution of the question, and that the Bill if put into force could under no circumstances bring about the object they all had in view. He went further, and maintained that it was absolutely beyond belief that a measure of this description could be tolerated by the House of Commons. He did not wish that the punishment of the evicted tenants should be eternal, that they should be punished for their follies for all time. He was willing to let by-gones be by-gones as he had said. The evicted tenant had deliberately dispossessed himself of the rights which were his, and he ought to be considered by hon. Members of that House as in a secondary position to the planter, to the man who had taken the farm, and probably had carried on a livelihood in a courageous and efficient manner. The attitude of the Irish Party always seemed to him to be a very curious one. He believed that their innate and hereditary animosity against the planter prompted them to extend unbounded and perfectly superfluous sympathy to the evicted tenant, at the risk of outraging all those preconceived ideas of liberty and fair play of which they were the professed champions. He did not desire to see a caretaker in the farm. He would like to see the evicted tenant back again so long as no injustice was done to anyone. The attitude of the Irish Party had undergone a certain amount of change in regard to these compulsory powers. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford said in June, 1903, that there was no intention to put into the Land Act any provision by which pressure direct or indirect could be brought to bear on the existing tenants, and that he would be no party to compulsion of any kind. He would like to know what had been the cause of the change of attitude on the part of the hon. and learned Member.

With regard to the number of tenants that were to be reinstated, they pressed the Chief Secretary in Committee to give them a little more information with regard to the number which it was proposed to reinstate in their holdings. The right hon. Gentleman could not claim to have been very explicit in the matter, and the Attorney-General went so far as to envelope all his statements with an air of great mystery. He would like the right hon. Gentleman to say that this Bill would be in operation only for a period of two or three years. There were no less than 4,000 tenants whose applications had been refused by the Estates Commissioners. What was to happen to them? As far as he could see from the Nationalist newspapers the demand for a settlement in regard to those 4,000 tenants would be brought up *ad infinitum*, and he looked forward, if the present Government remained in office long—and he hoped they would not—to other demands for reinstatement, and other deserving farmers would be evicted to make room for them. In conferring these powers on the three Commissioners the Government were adopting a very dangerous principle, because they were constituting an all-powerful body whose decisions would be of a final character. It might be said that this would be done on the grounds of economy because they did not wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to advance any more money for dispensing justice. It was an unheard of thing to appoint the purchaser of property as the arbiter of the price, and the proposal was bound to set up a series of gross anomalies. It was placing the Commissioners in a very serious position, and he did not think it would be possible for them to carry out their duties efficiently. He did not propose to say a word against the Commissioners, because he looked upon them simply as the machine for carrying out the duties allocated to them by their masters in office, and if there was any blame he should attribute that blame to the masters, who he considered were responsible for the actions of their subordinates. The argument had been continually put forward that these Commissioners were appointed by the Unionist Party. That was perfectly true, but they were appointed in connection with the Land Act of 1903, and the duties they had to carry out devolved upon them under that Act. He did not see any justification for expecting the Opposition to support the allocation of entirely different duties to them. It was obvious that if this Bill ever became law the first work of the Estates Commissioners would be to deal with the evicted tenants, and obviously the remainder of their duties would be carried on with difficulty because of the amount of work they would be called upon to perform. The Secretary for India in 1894 gave as a reason for setting up a separate tribunal that the Land Commission had enough to do. For that reason he hoped the Chief Secretary would see his way to set up a separate tribunal and allow the Estates Commissioners to continue the work they had been doing in the past with so much benefit to the evicted tenants, 1,000 of whom had already been restored. If this course were adopted he was convinced that the slight additional cost would be justified by the knowledge that justice would be dispensed all round. He had endeavoured to show why the Bill was unnecessary, and he had shown that the Land Act was working as expeditiously as possible. He protested now, and he would always protest against the entirely unjustifiable attitude the Government had adopted in introducing into the measure compulsory powers, which were entirely opposed to all their previous ideas. He sincerely hoped that if the Bill was not rejected it would at least be amended to such an extent that it might be handed down to posterity as a measure which would dispense justice and equity to all concerned.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.) in seconding the Motion, said that the objections which he and his friends entertained to the Bill were not inspired by any disinclination to see the evicted tenants question finally disposed of. There was no truth in the suggestion made in the course of the debates that they desired to keep the question open. Such a statement was not only inaccurate and misleading, but obviously absurd. The Party which was responsible for the passing of the Land Act of 1903, which included provisions for the settlement of the evicted tenants question on fair and even generous terms, could not be justly accused of factious opposition to agrarian peace in Ireland. They opposed the Bill because they believed it had been formed in such a way as to inflict serious injustice upon a very large body of persons in Ireland. The Bill placed in the hands of the Estates Commissioners powers of coercion against landowners and a particular class of occupiers of agricultural land. It would enable the Commissioners to go to a landowner and say: "We want so many acres of your estate; we will pay so much for the land and no more. If you agree to those terms, well and good; if you do not agree, you are powerless to object. We mean to have the land, and we shall take it from you against your will." The Bill also empowered the Commissioners to go to a farmer who held a farm from which a tenant had been evicted and say to him: "You must clear out, we want your holding for another man. It does not matter to us how long you have been in occupation of the land, or what amount of labour you have put into the soil. It does not matter how much you may have spent in improvements, you must go. We will pay you a certain sum and give you a farm elsewhere, but in any case you must clear out." In addition it gave the Commissioners a tenure of office which placed them practically beyond the control of the executive and practically beyond the control of that House. A Bill which conferred upon three individuals such unprecedented powers of compulsion ought at least to have been closely examined in all its details before it was permitted to pass the House. It was introduced under the ten minutes rule, a rule which was intended to apply only to measures of an uncontentious character. The result was that of the fifteen clauses of which the Bill was composed only two, the first and third, had been discussed at all. Even those two clauses were only discussed in part, and the other thirteen clauses, which embodied most important principles, and set up the most drastic machinery of coercion, had been forced through the House literally without a moment's consideration so far as the details were concerned. That fact alone justified them in opposing the Third Reading of the Bill. In addition to that they contended that the case for compulsion in connection with the reinstatement of the evicted tenants had never been proved. He might go so far as to say that no real attempt had been made by the Government to justify the very drastic measures of compulsion which were introduced into the Bill. He did not object personally to the compulsory purchase of land. As a fact he voted for compulsion in the House years ago, when compulsion was thought to be the only means of settling the Irish land question, and he would be prepared to do so again if the necessity for compulsion was proved to exist. But he submitted that in order to justify the use of compulsion it must be shown conclusively that voluntary action had altogether failed, and that the question at issue could be finally disposed of only upon compulsory terms. On neither of these two points had the Government proved their case in connection with the Bill now before the House. As regarded the failure of voluntary action, the facts, so far as they had been ascertained, certainly did not support the view they were now considering. On the contrary, they established the contention that the reinstatement of the evicted tenants could be accomplished on voluntary lines, without any resort to the violent and oppressive methods which had found favour with the Government. There was the fact that over a thousand evicted tenants had already been restored to the land under the Act of 1903—by purely voluntary means, and with the assistance and good will of the landowners concerned. That was to say, a third of the whole number of persons who were entitled to be restored, according to the Report of the Estates Commissioners, had been placed in possession of holdings—without friction and without injustice to anyone. That had been accomplished in three and a half years, and there was every reason to believe that if the Government would devote their energies to expediting the working of the Land Purchase Act, the evicted tenants question would settle itself in a reasonable amount of time. But apart from that, the facts given in the Report of the Estates Commissioners showed that there was plenty of untenanted land which might be purchased at a fair price—sufficient, and more than sufficient, to place the selected 2,000 evicted tenants in possession of economic holdings. The land now in the hands of the Estates Commissioners was ample for that purpose. They said they wanted that land to satisfy the requirements of persons who wanted larger holdings. But that did not by any means represent the amount of land which they might acquire by voluntary sale. The Chief Secretary had admitted that in addition to the 80,000 acres now in the possession of the Estates Commissioners, they had received particulars of nearly 60,000 acres which the owners were willing to sell for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants. Those 60,000 acres had been offered by 160 owners, and the fact showed that there was no disinclination on the part of landowners to sell all the land that could possibly be required—if they were offered the fair market price. The Government had failed altogether to show that compulsion was necessary. But in spite of that fact they had insisted upon giving these novel and dangerous powers to the Estates Commissioners, and had not accompanied them by any safeguards to prevent injustice being done to the persons against whom the powers were to be used. The refusal of the Government to afford any protection to landowners or tenants against the abuse of the powers given in the Bill constituted to his mind one of the main grounds for refusing to assent to the Third Reading. There was, however, one other objection to the Bill which he desired to submit to the consideration of the House. He objected to the Bill because it was intended to give preferential treatment to one class of tenant-purchasers, as compared with another and very much larger class of persons who, from every point of view, were in his opinion more deserving of consideration by the House. There were hundreds of farmers—in his own constituency and in all parts of Ireland—who had been waiting for two or three years to obtain the advantages of the Land Act of 1903, and who would be kept out of the benefits of ownership for an indefinite period if the Bill passed in its present shape, and if it was worked as the Government evidently intended that it should be worked. He asked the House to consider for a moment the position of the class of farmers to whom he alluded. They had agreed with their landords for the purchase of their holdings, but until the Estates Commissioners had investigated their cases, sanctioned the advances, and vested their holdings in them as purchasers, they had to pay interest on the amount of the purchase money. That interest represented a sum considerably larger than the amount of the annuity they would eventually pay to the State; and, in addition to that hardship, they were not advancing any nearer to the time when their farms would be absolutely their own property, without any charge upon it whatever. He submitted that the priority which the Bill would give to the evicted tenants was not in accordance with the terms of the arrangement embodied in the Act of 1903. He would like to call the attention of the House to Paragraph 15 of the Land Conference Report of 1902, which reads as follows—

> "That any project for the solution of the Irish land problem should be accompanied by a settlement of the evicted tenants question upon an equitable basis."

That proposal clearly indicated that the solution of the land question and the settlement of the evicted tenants question were to proceed *pari passu*, and it could not be shown, either by reference to the debates on the Bill of 1903 or to that Act itself, that there was any intention that the evicted tenants question was to be given priority in point of settlement. The Chief Secretary, on the introduction of this Bill, asserted that "one of the terms of this concordat" (that was to say, the understanding upon which the Act of 1903 was based) "was the speedy restoration of the evicted tenants." As he had shown, however, the right hon. Gentleman overstated the case. What was contemplated was undoubtedly the speedy settlement of the whole land question; but there was never any intention of giving priority to the evicted tenants over the other farmers who desired to become owners of their holdings. The Chief Secretary now attempted to justify the priority which it was proposed to accord to the evicted tenants by the argument that it was necessary in order to promote peace in Ireland. But did the right hon. Gentleman really suppose that he was going to promote peace by a Bill which would not only inflict injustice upon landowners and the class of farmers who were known as "new tenants," but also increase the hardships which the delay of land purchase was causing to the large class of tenant-farmers who had agreed to purchase under the Act of 1903? He did not see how he could hope to advance the peaceful settlement of the Irish land question by such means. It was evident that for some time to come the Estates Commissioners would be wholly engrossed in the work of reinstating the evicted tenants, and all the funds available for land purchase would be used for the purposes of this Bill. They could form no estimate whatever of the period of time which the work would take; because, as had again and again been pointed out, there was absolutely no element of finality in the Bill. The Chief Secretary had steadfastly resisted every proposal which was intended to limit the extent of the problem. When the 2,000 —more or less—whom the Government, said they contemplated restoring to their holdings, had been reinstated, there would still remain upwards of 5,000 disappointed applicants for holdings, in whose behalf a fresh agitation would certainly be started; and there was nothing in the Bill to prevent the Estates Commissioners reopening the cases of the 5,000, and making a further selection of persons to be reinstated. He asked whether it was reasonable or just that the ordinary farmer who had supported himself by his industry, paid his way, and kept free from lawless agitation, should be kept in suspense, while the class of persons for whose special benefit the Bill was being enacted were given preferential treatment, which nobody could with truth say they had deserved. He ventured to say that it was neither reasonable nor just that this discrimination should be made to the prejudice of a most deserving class of men; and it was on this ground, as well as because he thought the measure was essentially unjust and oppressive, that he should vote against the Third Reading of the Bill. He begged to second the Motion.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Viscount Castlereagh.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. LARDNER (Monaghan, N.) said he desired to make some observations of a general character in support of the Bill. He came from a part of Ireland where the agrarian conditions had made him familiar with the question of the evicted tenants. Those who knew the facts would admit that there was urgent need for such a Bill as this. His own opinion was that it did not go far enough, but he could only congratulate the Chief Secretary on having had the courage to bring forward the measure, It was a matter of history that in 1903 an agreement was arrived at that the evicted tenants were to be restored to their holdings. That was assented to by both landlords and tenants, and it was only when the process of restoration was tried that the difficulties were disclosed which had necessitated the giving of compulsory powers to the Estates Commissioners. Though four years had elapsed since the Act of 1903 was passed, there were still a large number of tenants on the roadside with no prospect of consideration save that which this Bill would give. In the cases where tenants had already been reinstated in their holdings through the landlords offering no objection to the making of voluntary arrangements it had not been stated either by the Estates Commissioners or by hon. Members from Ulster that these men had not succeeded in their holdings. These tenants had been restored on the sale of estates by landlords who, were it not for the Act of 1903, would have themselves gone to the wall. There was another class of landlords — wealthy men — who could afford it and were determined to hold out for a prohibitive price and to keep the flag of landlordism flying until the last ditch was reached. There could be no peace in Ireland so long as men who had been evicted from their farms found those farms occupied, and the fruits of the labour of themselves and their fathers enjoyed by tenants generally brought from other parts of the country. So long as that state of affairs remained there would be no peace in Ireland, and the only remedy for it was, as the Chief Secretary had said and proposed in this Bill, the application of compulsion for the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. Of course, there was a howl from the Ulster Members, as there always was when any measure was introduced for the amelioration of the condition of the Irish people. There were two classes of people in Ireland—the Irish people and the Ulster Unionists. Any argument had been good enough for the Ulster Members to use in opposition to this Bill. He thought that on examination it would be found that the arguments of the Ulster Members were very like the outrages they had discovered in different parts of Ireland—there was not much in them. The first thing they did was to impeach the fairness of the Estates Commissioners, whom they now most bitterly attacked, and who had been for years engaged in fixing fair rents without any objection being made to them. The Estates Commissioners had also been engaged in the valuation of farms for pre-emption by the landlords when the tenants wished to sell, and no objection had been then made to them. The capacity of the Estates Commissioners for that business was proved by their long experience in the value of land, and that was the case with Mr. Bailey, against whom no word had been heard when he was an assistant Commissioner hearing applications to fix the fair value of a tenant's holding. It was said that the landlords had no confidence in the Estates Commissioners. He quite agreed. The landlords had no confidence in anyone unless they had him under their thumb or he was a pliant tool. He was under the impression that the Estates Commissioners had been appointed by the late Tory Government, but it was of a piece with their usual practice to discredit their own officers. It was said that there was no necessity for compulsion. But what were the facts? For many years there had been operating in Ireland a Labourers Act in order to provide healthy homes for the labourers, but the majority of the landlords had refused to sell sites for cottages for the labourers, who were now living in the most squalid conditions, even when a good price was offered them for the sites. Here were people who surely owed a duty to those among whom they lived, and it might have been thought that they would have given sites for cottages and small gardens to the humble labourers who worked their land. There was no method of dealing with such men except by compulsion. The hon. Member for Maidstone had said that compulsion was unheard of in land legislation, and the only analogy he could give was railways. He would suggest a better analogy to the noble Lord. Under the Act of 1881 the landlord got a right of pre-emption when the tenant offered his farm for sale. What did that mean? The tenant for some reason being anxious to dispose of his farm, intimated the fact to the landlord, who immediately said: "I want to buy it." The tenant sent in an application to the Land Commissioners, two of whom were now Estates Commissioners, to fix the true value of the farm, goodwill, and tenant's improvements on the holding, whereupon the landlord could compulsorily acquire the tenant's interest in the holding at a price which generally was a third less than the tenant would have obtained in open market. He would suggest to the hon. Members for Ulster that if there could be any doubt as to what action they should take in regard to this Bill, they should consult their constituents, who, he could assure them, would tell them that the Bill was as badly needed in Ulster as in any other part of Ireland. As to the applications which had not been sent in to the Estates Commissioners before 1st May, 1907, he knew of cases where the tenants were evicted but taken on as caretakers. These unfortunate men were afraid to send in to the Estates Commissioners their notices for reinstatement because they were afraid that the landlord would turn them out on the road. The agreement made in the Act of 1903 should be acted up to and carried into effect both in the letter and the spirit in the fullest sense of the word. Anyone who knew the condition of the country recognised that the matter should be dealt with at once if there was to be peace and prosperity in Ireland. He would ask hon. Members above the gangway to rise to considerations above party or personal interest with the desire to do what was really best for their country and for the tenants who had been evicted from their homes.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) congratulated the hon. Member for Monaghan on the excellent and moderate speech he had delivered, and the Nationalist Party on the accession they had obtained in the hon. Member to their ranks. He differed, however, from the hon. Member in regard to the agreement of 1903. If he was a party to that agreement he would rather cut off his hands than draw back from it, but it was clear to him that under the Act of 1903 it was believed that voluntary methods were going to be adopted; therefore it was not fair that Unionist Members should be accused by the Nationalists of breaking the agreement when the Unionist objection was that compulsory methods were expressly excluded by it. He had opposed this Bill from the outset, not so much in the desire to protect the landlord interest, although he considered that interest deserved protection, but because those who were called new tenants were treated under it unjustly and inequitably. These tenants were people who came to a great extent from Ulster, and Ulster Members would therefore be failing in their duty if they did not attempt to secure for them the full protection of the law. In performing that duty they had been beaten as a minority in that House, but great and important principles underlay the whole question. It was undoubtedly a day of triumph for hon. Members below the gangway who were identified with the principles of Socialism. [Laughter.] Hon. Members might laugh, but what he said was true. The Bill proposed to supply holdings in Ireland at an estimated cost of something like £2,500,000 of public money, for the benefit of from between 2,500 to 4,000 tenants. That was essentially Socialism; but in another respect it was not. Let the House understand where they were. He did not think he was doing any injustice to hon. Members below the gangway when he said that the Socialism in the Bill began and ended with the provision that the taxpayers were to contribute the money to put it in operation. But he always understood that the principle of Socialism was that one man was as good as another. He did not understand that it was part of Socialism to turn one man out of a farm and put another in his place. The Nationalists might also claim a triumph because they could, while seeking to controvert the views of the Sin Fein party, point out that in consequence of the pressure they had put on the Government they had succeeded in passing this Bill. He wished them joy of it. But who were the people who were to pay for these Socialist and United Irish League triumphs? It would not be the minority who had been outvoted in the House of Commons; it would be the new tenants—those who took the farms twenty-five years ago under the security of the law—those who took the land from which tenants had been evicted for non-fulfilment of their legal obligation. They had been a credit to the neighbourhood in the great majority of cases; they had proved industrious, hard-working, and law-abiding men, and it had been their obedience to the law alone that had rendered them so unpopular with the agitators of the United Irish League. These were the people on whom the sting of this injustice would fall. They had heard much of the love of the Irish tenant for his holding; were these tenants' feelings to be ignored? They had made these farms their homes; they had embarked their all in them; but the only sympathy extended to them was to be found in the suggestion of the hon. Member for Louth, that they should be deported to Canada. It was regrettable that the hardship should in the first instance fall on this inoffensive, humble, industrious class. But, as the hon. Member for Mid Armagh had pointed out, another class of people would also have to pay for this Socialist and United Irish League triumph, and that was the tenants all over Ireland who were seeking to buy their holdings. In 1884 the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture said he would not sanction taking land for evicted tenants because land purchase was then struggling and it would mean building a barrier across its path. At that time as much money was available for land purchase as could possibly be required; there were millions at the Treasury which could be resorted to. But to-day, although there was £30,000,000 of land under contract to be bought for which the Treasury was unable to find the money, they were under this Bill going to ask for £2,500,000 more for the reinstatement of evicted tenants. The Bill, indeed, created another injustice: it put a premium on eviction, and it held up as a public martyr the evicted tenant. It put him in a better position; it not only gave him a farm of 40 acres, but it handed him £300 with which to stock it, and turned out the man against whom for twenty-five years he had been uttering vindictive threats. Thus a premium was put on the *status* of the evicted tenant, who was being made a most prosperous and successful martyr. As he had said, all these Socialist and Nationalist triumphs would have to be paid for, and most of all by the Liberal Party. In succumbing to such pressure that Party was sowing seed the harvest of which would have to be reaped in other fields. The principles of this Bill would have to be carried into other things. How could Liberal Members denounce Socialism when they set their hand and seal to such a Bill? They did not get rid of these deserving tenant-farmers whom they were sacrificing merely by calling them "planters" and "grabbers." These men had a right to protection and justice, and they were being abandoned by the Liberal Government just as Gordon was abandoned. It was a cruel and crying injustice that the Liberal Party should run away from the very men whom by all the laws of honour and conscience they were bound to protect. It was more than an injustice—it was a crime; and so long as he had power to voice his opinion in that House he would protest against it.

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.) said that the eighteen stalwarts above the gangway who had talked the House empty two or three times had proved that there was no opposition to this Bill in any quarter of the House except that which they occupied. Even their own Front Bench had not supported them. The Leader of the Opposition had contributed some very delightful speeches, but he had washed his hands of the hon. Members for Ulster, and had poked fun at them but refused to support them, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin had told the House that if he thought the Bill would end finally the evicted tenant trouble he would vote for it. It could not be said that the opposition to the measure was very virile. Hon. Members for Ulster wanted more time for the discussion of the Bill only to induce the House of Lords either to make the Bill worthless or to reject it altogether. But he could not believe that noble Lords were so simple as to fall into the clumsy trap of the hon. Member for North Antrim.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): He is the evicted tenant of North Antrim.

SIR WALTER NUGENT, continuing, said he meant, of course, the hon. Member for North Armagh. Let hon. Members be merciful as they were strong, and not drag down the noble Lords with themselves to that ignoble death, but let them end their days in a more glorious action than that of trying to deprive a handful of unfortunate Irish tenants of the promises made them by two consecutive Governments.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) assured the Chief Secretary that Irishmen and Englishmen on that side felt as genuine a desire to solve this troublesome question as he did. But they offered the most uncompromising opposition to the Bill as it now stood. Personally he could never vote for such a Bill, but he desired to know whether any compromise was possible which they could accept. The Land Act of 1903 was intended to be the end of a long agrarian struggle, and the new era was inaugurated by a general amnesty. As the hon. Member for East Mayo said at the time, it was to close the chapter of war and open the chapter of peace. No doubt it was a serious thing for public money to be given for the reinstatement of tenants who had lost their holdings either through lawlessness, incompetence, or misfortune. But three considerations prevailed, and he thought rightly. First, that the paramount interest of Ireland was peace; secondly, that the problem as then presented was one of moderate compass, the hon. Member for East Mayo estimating the number of cases to be dealt with at 400; and thirdly, the most important point of all, that all the transactions under the Act of 1903 were to be purely voluntary. No compulsion was to be brought to bear on either landlords or new tenants. But, despite the fact that the concession was made to the evicted tenants as the price of peace, since 1903 there had been a renewal of agrarian war in Ireland. Moreover, the number of tenants to be dealt with had gradually mounted up, the 400 had become 2,000, even after all deductions had been made. Naturally this increased the difficulty of the solution, but in his opinion it need not be a fatal bar. The crucial point was that the voluntary basis had been abandoned, and the Legislature was asked to step in and bring about the reinstatement of these tenants by compulsory means. There they came to the heart of the difficulty. The new tenants under this Bill might be evicted against their consent. They on that side, however, held that the State was under an obligation of honour to the planter, as he was called. The word of the State had been pledged to him, but it was not merely a legal obligation. The planter, in many instances, had performed a real public service by displaying moral courage at a critical time when it was not easy to do so. Was his courage and honesty to be visited with penal consequences? No man of honour would be guilty of such desertion in private life; was it less dishonourable conduct in the State? The Chief Secretary had never fairly met that argument. He treated it as a flimsy thing of little substance. Anyhow that was not the view of his colleague and predecessor in office, the Secretary for India. When he was responsible for the government of Ireland and brought in an Evicted Tenants Bill, in 1894, the right hon. Gentleman recognised that this was the crux of the difficulty; and what was more, he saw that he had a debt of honour to the new tenants, and he stood by them loyally. These were his words—

> "I always said, in spite of the representations made to me, that these men shall not be put out against their will."

The present Chief Secretary had, indeed, declared that *bona fide* farmers should not be dispossessed from their holdings. But there was nothing in his Bill to prevent this, and, indeed, many demanded their expulsion. Let him, therefore, give legislative force to his intention. Let him insert an express provision to the effect that no tenant, genuinely farming this land, should come within the scope of the evicting clauses of the Bill. For himself he was much against bringing compulsion to bear even on the so-called "bogus farmer" or caretaker. But his case was less strong; it might, to some extent, be met by money compensation or by the offer of a farm elsewhere. If only full safeguards were provided for the genuine farmer, the possibility would be afforded of a compromise in the interests of peace. He would earnestly submit this to the consideration of the Chief Secretary. Next, as to compulsion on the landlord. Compulsory power for acquiring land for a public object was no new principle. Everyone was familiar with the ordinary procedure. But what was new and unheard of was the proposal to invest three, or rather two, men with a roving commission to go through Ireland, to descend on any land they chose, to take what they would, from whom they would, and at what price they would, and all without appeal. That was without parallel in the history of the legislation of this country. Was it not plainly equitable that the landlord should have an appeal against these decisions, and also that any planter whom it was proposed to oust should have a similar appeal? Probably no better tribunal could be suggested for this purpose than the Judge of Assize. The two matters he had insisted on—the protection of the planters and the right of appeal—were of primary moment. There was one other less vital perhaps, but of high importance, and that was that there should be some strict limitation of the number of tenants to be reinstated. Already the list of applicants had been sifted and sorted. The Commissioners had arrived at 2,000 as the probable number of claims which should be admitted. The Chief Secretary had refused to bind himself to the precise figure of 2,000 on the ground that he did not wish to close the door on a few outstanding cases, half a dozen more or less. Well then, let him allow a margin sufficient to cover all such contingencies; let the maximum number be fixed at 2,040 or 2,050. The precise figure mattered little, but a definite limit mattered much. Applicants who had been ruled out should remain out. If the Bill gave power to reopen these cases the original 8,000 applicants would all press for their claims to be reconsidered. We would have before long two permanent Commissions sitting in Ireland, one to declare what was a fair rent and the other to reinstate those who had not paid it. What was now adopted as a political necessity would tend to become a principle of policy. Nor let it be forgotten in discussing this question of evictions that the State was already far the biggest landlord or rent collector in Ireland. Each year was adding to its financial responsibilities. Tenant-farmers were becoming proprietors of their holdings. The mere transfer of land from one set of owners to another would not get rid of poverty or distress. There were a large number of uneconomic holdings tenanted by uneconomic men. Some of these men would, he feared, become insolvent. The State was bound to look ahead. It would be a bad start to evict tenants who had paid their rent in order to restore others who had not paid, some of whom would probably be again evicted five years hence. It might tide over a Party difficulty in the House of Commons, but it would add to the economic dangers of the situation and lay up a store of trouble for the future.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, S.) said the last speaker had expressed a hope that this Bill would come back from another place in an altered form. The Leader of the Party of which the hon. Gentleman was a Member expressed a like hope in respect of another Bill on another occasion, and the Members of the other place obeyed his invitation. Was the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University about to usurp the leadership of the Party and address an invitation to the Members of the other House with the expectation that they would respond to it? The hon. Member had said that the Bill was opposed by all hon. Members on his own side of the House above the gangway. The fact was that whenever there was a measure before the House calculated to benefit the people of Ireland the hon. Member for Cambridge University was sure to be found opposing it. At one time they hoped that Ireland had his sympathy—that was in the early days of his career in that House—when he made a certain speech in regard to education, but since then he had never failed to oppose every suggestion for the relief of his fellow countrymen, he never lost an opportunity of backing up the very worst statements regarding Ireland that were made by Members for Ulster, and he never failed to puncture the erudite collegiate lectures he addressed to the House with the abuse of his country, and his countrymen, such was his bad taste. [Cries of "Oh!"] Of course the term "bad taste" did not commend itself to some of the hon. Gentleman's friends. It was a bad thing for the hon. Members above the gangway who opposed the Bill that the evicted tenants who sought to be restored gave their Party the opportunity in 1903 of introducing the Bill which was probably the one Act in the last Parliament which entitled them to the gratitude of Ireland, and the one really good statesmanlike measure they passed into law. It was bad taste on their part to oppose the Bill that gave one of their most ornamental Members, the Member for Dover, the opportunity of establishing his character as a statesman, and it was also bad taste on their part to oppose a measure introduced to benefit the men who enabled their Party to pass a Bill to relieve their own class in Ireland—the landlords. It was the most exquisite bad taste on the part of the hon. Member for North

Armagh to oppose the Bill for the reinstatement of men who enabled the House to pass a measure that made it possible for him to sell his land at probably ten years purchase more than it was worth. He was informed that the hon. Member for North Armagh got thirty years purchase for the land he held. They had had from the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone, who moved the rejection of the Bill, a lot of lip sympathy with the evicted tenants. He was burning with anxiety for their restoration. He hoped that they would be restored at some future time. He had no feeling of enmity against them whatever. How did it come to pass, then, that he and those who acted with him had opposed the Bill at every stage, and that the noble Lord had stated that he would oppose it to the very end? That was a very curious way of showing his sympathy with the evicted tenants. The noble Lord was not content with that statement, but he accused the Nationalists of the crime of turning the planters out on the roadside. The word "crime" came badly from the mouth of an Irish landlord. The noble Lord and his family had large estates in Ireland. Other hon. Gentlemen above the gangway and their friends had also large estates there, and they ought not to mention the word "crime," for their whole career as landlords in Ireland was one continued crime.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Why?

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR said he would tell the hon. Gentleman, whose family also had large estates in Ireland. He was not old enough to remember the coffin ships which went away after the famine of 1846–7, which the landlords did nothing to prevent.

MR. ASHLEY said that on the estate with which his father was connected very much money was spent in building roads and harbours during the famine.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR said that this country and the whole civilised world had to come to the aid of the people of Ireland. The landlords exacted their rents in that period just the same. The word "crime" therefore did not fit in their mouths, for their system and the laws passed to maintain Irish landlordism in its oppressive and extortionate demands had reduced the population of Ireland from 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 as it was in 1846 to something like 4,500,000 now. Was not that a crime? Why the bed of the Atlantic from Ireland to America was whitened with the bones of the people who had been driven out of their homes by the criminal system of which hon. Members above the gangway were the representatives in that House. They were told by those representatives of Irish landlordism that they were guilty of the crime of turning the planters out of holdings where they had been for so many years. They were told by the noble Lord that they regarded the evicted tenants as heroes. Yes, they did. He said they were law-breakers. Were there no law-breakers in the history of countries other than the evicted tenants of Ireland? Were there not found in the history of the world law-breakers who were regarded as heroes by the people who read history? They regarded these men as heroes, because at a time of great stress and trouble they manfully went out of their own homes so that a change might be brought about in the law which would enable people to live and thrive on their own farms. It had been said by almost everyone who had spoken against the Bill that they objected to it because of the principle of compulsion in it. Was there not before the House a Bill called the Small Holdings (English) Bill in which there was to be found the principle of compulsion in a much greater degree than was proposed in the Bill they were discussing? It did not provide for the compensation of anybody who might be disturbed, whilst this Bill did provide for compensation for disturbance of the new tenants. The principle of compulsion had been always adopted by that House and by the country when it was for the public good. Those who took the opposite view said they knew of only one precedent, viz., that of taking land for the making of railways and for public purposes. But that was for the convenience of the people. It was admitted that there could be no peace in Ireland where evicted tenants were sitting down watching their holdings either derelict or in the possession of persons who were undoubtedly objectionable to them and to their neighbours, and he would say that the peace of Ireland or any important part of Ireland was of much higher consequence than the convenience of the people which was the basis for the compulsory acquisition of land under the Land Clauses Acts. It had been repeatedly stated that they who sat on those benches stated in 1903 during the passage of the Land Act that no pressure would be brought to bear upon the new tenants. Had any pressure been brought to bear upon them? Had hon. Members above the gangway been able to produce one instance where pressure had been brought to bear upon any one of the new tenants there would have been some reason in their statement. He had listened attentively to the debates, and he had never heard any statement contradictory of the promise made by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford that no pressure would be brought to bear upon the new tenants. Why, it would be asked, should compulsion be introduced and why did they say it was absolutely necessary? It was necessary because after four years trial without pressure being brought to bear upon the new tenants the evil still existed, and was likely to continue to exist unless pressure, not outside, but within the law, was used for the purpose of removing men without injury to them and restoring the evicted tenants. He submitted that there was absolutely no force in the argument used against the compulsory clauses in the Bill. They were absolutely necessary. Four years experience had shown that the Act of 1903 was inadequate for the purpose. It had, therefore, become necessary to introduce this measure and to include in it such powers as would enable the Government to remove those who were an obstacle to the settlement of the question and in order to restore to their holdings men who, by their self-sacrifice, made possible the passing of the Act of 1903, which was such a credit to the Party who now opposed this Bill, which they all trusted would result in lasting benefit to the Irish people.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) said he had listened to practically all the speeches delivered against the Bill, and he could not find out that any objection was taken to the principle of the reinstatement of evicted tenants. In fact the very moderate and eloquent speech of the noble Lord who moved the rejection of the measure, so far from persuading him to vote against it, rather confirmed his idea as to the necessity of the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. The noble Lord had made a statement which came to him like a bolt from the blue. He had told them that it was necessary to let bygones be bygones, and that in the interests of peace and for the cessation of agrarian trouble the evicted tenants should be reinstated. He had also pointed out how the Act of 1903 justified that contention, and that in three and a half years 1,000 of the evicted tenants had been reinstated. He could not reconcile the speech of the noble Lord with that of the hon. Member for North Armagh, who had pointed out that this was a dangerous business — that it had the taint of Socialism, or, in other words, the taint of the United Irish League. He did not mind whether it had the taint of Socialism or of the United Irish League, provided the admitted grievance was removed. It was admitted by all parties that it was a desirable thing that these tenants should be reinstated. The only difference between them was that the Government and the Chief Secretary were anxious to effect the restoration as quickly as possible while the Opposition desired that it should be done under the Act of 1903 as in the past, viz., at the rate of 1,000 in three and a half years. He represented South Belfast, and he had never discovered that this question of the reinstatement of the evicted tenants had ever been discussed in that constituency. He did not think the attention of Belfast had been seriously called to the subject. The pledge given by that House, however, if it was to be worth anything at all, ought to be carried out. They were told that if the present possessors, the planters or new tenants, were disturbed, they would suffer grievous harm; they would be turned out of their holdings for the sake of the evicted tenants, and if he thought for a moment that they would be injured he would not vote for the Bill. And that was just the thing he wanted to know. If he thought that the Government, coming in with a measure for the purpose of reinstating the evicted tenants would do an injustice and inflict hardship and harm on the new tenants he would certainly vote against the measure. But these planters had the choice of other holdings. [Cries of "No."] Well, they had not got the choice; it was very little choice that tenants of Ireland ever got. The question of choice was a new theme to advocate on that side of the House. In any case, however, the tenants were to be compensated, or they were to be put into holdings which would enable them, if they were economical, to make as comfortable, decent and prosperous a living as where they were now. It was a very generous action that they should be enabled to remove themselves to other holdings. [Cries of "They are removed."] Well, they were removed by Act of Parliament, if they liked; but for what purpose? For the purpose of enabling those whose ancestors had been for generations in a ho'ding to be sent back to that holding. If it was said that the present tenants, the planters, were to be evicted to attain that object, the reply was that they were only evicted as a means to the reinstatement of the originally evicted tenants. They were not to be turned out on to the roadside as were the unfortunate people previously evicted. They were to be put into possession of other holdings. All that was asked was that there should be peace in Ireland. Strife had been going on for too long among one section of the country only, and not among the democracy. They desired to put an end to that strife, which would be for the good of the country, whether they called it Socialism or not. In the North of Ireland they were sick and tired of being constantly warned about the Union being in danger, and of seeing the progress of the country blocked in the interests of a particular class. He did not object to hon. Members near him advocating landlordism; but if they did that, why not do it openly, and not under the guise of the Union? Every Member of the House who had an open mind and a desire to help his country must wish that religion and politics should not intervene where the object was to help a class who could not help themselves. No man could come to the House but was bound to regret the attitude of certain sections of it towards the efforts of a humble class to get back to the soil of their fathers. He had no fear about going back to his constituency to justify the votes he had given on this Bill. Only justice was demanded. He did not say that it was unitedly demanded, for he did not think they would ever be united in Ireland, though there were some questions on which they might be united. It was an unfortunate thing that they could not come and ask the House unitedly for the removal of a grievance in Ireland. The cause of progress in Ireland had been blocked by religious bickerings which ought never to enter into social reforms. It was with a view to trying to erase these insane obstacles, to remove, if possible, unnecessary arguments against progressive measures which benefited the whole country, irrespective of any class, that he most cordially supported the Third Reading of the Bill.

MR. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) said he thought he could not do better than call the attention of the House to the most extraordinary misapprehension of the entire question shown by the hon. Member for South Belfast. So far as he understood, everyone on those benches had expressed his desire that the question of the evicted tenants should be settled, and no one had objected to the principle of compulsion being applied where it could be shown to be necessary. But the difference between them arose as to the method in which the reinstatement of the evicted tenants was to be effected, and on this issue there was fair ground of objection against the Bill. He thought one of the first duties of the House, once they were agreed that a certain thing should be done, was to do it in the way least injurious to others interested. What were the objections which had been raised? He did not propose to deal with the speech made by the hon. and learned Member below the gangway, nor with the speech of another hon. Member according to whom there ought to be no Third Reading at all, and once the Government had a sufficient majority to express its will no one else should be allowed to open their lips. That was a position to which the House of Commons had not yet attained, and he trusted that some of those who sat on the opposite benches agreed with him in hoping that it would never be attained. That House was a place where freedom of discussion ought to exist and be encouraged. What were the questions they had to deal with? First of all, this Bill had never been adequately considered by the House. It was brought in hastily. It was perfectly true that it was referred to in the King's Speech, but they could not shut their eyes to the fact that its introduction was due to the failure of a bigger measure which did not meet with the acceptance of the persons for whose benefit it was supposed to be introduced. The present Bill was brought in under the ten minutes rule, which shortened the time for discussion; in Committee the closure was applied, with the result that some of the clauses of greatest importance were not considered at all. A matter of vital importance was what was to happen to those tenants who were called planters? There was a very large number of tenants at the present moment in Ireland, representing holdings valued at about £20,000,000, who had agreed to purchase those holdings, and had entered into agreements, not with landlords who were impecunious and driven to sell, as had been suggested by the hon. and learned Member below the gangway, but with landlords who although perfectly willing and able to keep their lands, had come to terms with their tenants. Those tenants, many of them, were not one day nearer the time when they would become the owners, and they were accordingly still paying interest. Then the resources of the Irish Land Commission for completing those sales were to be reduced by £2,500,000. What had those tenants done that they should be set back by the period represented by that sum? What sin had they committed that they should be treated in that way? In regard to those tenants who had been evicted, what was to happen? They took an estate, for example, which the tenants were anxious to purchase, but not one of them had yet purchased their holdings. They were fulfilling their engagements honestly; they were industrious and in every way deserving; and yet it was proposed to put beside them one or more of the evicted tenants. He was not going to attack the whole of the evicted tenants; but it might be that among them they would find men who had been neither industrious nor careful, and had brought themselves into a position which would not be occupied by anyone of ordinary prudence and industry. One of these men might be brought back and planted as a purchaser in the midst of honest tenants who were still ordinary tenants under judicial rents. Did they think that a fair and reasonable course to adopt? That was the position brought about by the Bill, and he thought the House ought to have seen that means were taken that no such position was made possible. They were told that the new tenants or planters had never been interfered with; but what was going to be done now? They were going to be removed whether they liked it or not. It was said they would be as well off and as comfortable as before; but if that was the intention of the Government, why did they not give the tenant the power to refuse or to consent? That would get rid of a good deal of the injustice of the Bill. Until something of that kind was done it was very little consolation to the man who had made a home that he should be turned out and put in another place whether he liked it or not. The Government said there had been no undue pressure, but the same thing might have been said before the Land Act of 1903 in reference to owners of large tracts of grazing land. When that Act was passed it led people to think that they ought to have such land for economic holdings, and the result had been cattle driving and outrages. It was compulsion exercised by people to drive the graziers from the land, and they had cattle driving as it existed in the West of Ireland. He had heard the excuse suggested that, the Legislature having provided certain things, the people thought they were working out too slowly, and that was the reason for their taking the law into their own hands. The same course would be adopted here. The people who wanted to get hold of the farms would exercise pressure on the same principle as it had been exercised in reference to grazing land. A man who went to the Commissioners and objected that he was not being fairly treated would be a marked man. Surely that could be guarded against in a measure of this kind. Surely these things ought not to be encouraged. It should not be beyond the power of the Chief Secretary and his advisers to suggest some safeguard, and he asked the House to say, at the last moment, that such a state of affairs ought in some way to be provided against, and that no inducement should be held out to the people to treat new tenants as they had treated the owners of the grazing farms. Then with regard to the fixing of prices, that was a matter that went to the root of the Bill, though the objection they urged against it was not one which they raised for the purpose of rejecting the Bill altogether. That had never been his attitude. His attitude was — let them have a Bill, but let it be on reasonable lines, so that the rights of the people affected by it were properly safeguarded. Then there would be very little opposition to it. There was no reason, justice, or necessity for making the Commissioners fix the price. It would be very easy to appoint a different tribunal. Another tribunal might give a less price, or it might give the same price, but at least it would give the person interested some idea that he was getting fair play. He denied that the purchaser of a property was the best tribunal in the eyes of the seller to determine what should be paid. No legislation had ever been enacted where a man who was to take land was to be the sole, ultimate, and absolute arbiter of the price to be paid. Why did not the Government offer an arbitrator to be appointed by the Local Government Board?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): Would you have taken him?

MR. GORDON did not know. Would the right hon. Gentleman insert some such provision in his Bill? If not, why not?

MR. BIRRELL: Because I think this is fairer to the landlord. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh"].

MR. GORDON thought that was a novel remark to come from the right hon. Gentleman. He had not heard it before. Under this Bill they had to determine what was to be given to the new tenant on the principle of what was given by a landlord when he had taken on a holding under the Land Act. He had been accustomed to the argument that the Commission in such cases had not given nearly enough to the tenant, and that when the tenant had had to give up his holding to his landlord he had been deprived of several years purchase. He had never yet heard of a tenant who did not complain and justly complain that the price given to him was not sufficient. That was what they were going to give to the new tenant.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The hon. Member is confusing this question with the time value fixed under Section 1 of the Act, the principle of which is different from that applied in cases of resumption under Section 5. We are giving the fullest compensation ever given under an Act of Parliament to a tenant quitting his holding.

MR. GORDON said he was surprised to hear that the principle was different. Yet that was how they were going to deal with the tenants under this Bill. They were going to be turned out at prices which no ordinary farmer would agree to. He thought that these tenants ought to be fully compensated and indemnified if they were to be touched at all. No matter what Party was in power, when they were dealing with property compulsorily, it was the duty of everyone to see that ample justice was done to the parties interfered with. He did not think the questions he was dealing with should affect the passing of some measure to settle within a reasonably short space of time the evicted tenants question. It was idle to go back to the question of how they came to be evicted or to do anything which would cause any real or substantial delay if a speedy settlement could be brought about on reasonable terms. But it was equally important when they were doing it to take care they did it in such a way as would effect the least injustice and inspire the most confidence in the people affected. He had lived in Ireland longer than the Chief Secretary and he knew how these questions were discussed. People thought a question was settled and after a little while someone came and said "You have not gone half far enough, you ought to have dealt with so and so," and the agitation was resumed as strongly as ever. Here the Government had limited the matter to 2,000 tenants and must therefore rule out 4,000 or 5,000 claims. The right hon. Gentleman would have these people saying they had been badly treated and asking why they should not be included with the others. For his own protection he entreated the right hon. Gentleman to put into the Bill some limitation of numbers or of acreage or something which would in some way show that Parliament intended to deal finally with the evicted tenants question in this Bill.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that the difficulties to which reference had been made had arisen through the Government of the day ignoring the representations made by the representatives of Ireland. That applied not only to the present but also to the past, because the voice of the people constitutionally expressed had been ignored. He desired to allude to a matter of considerable importance. The Member for West Waterford introduced a clause on the Report Stage which was debated and supported by the hon. Member for the City of Waterford, and the Nationalist Party thought it was so important that they divided the House upon it. They fully recognised that the Chief Secretary had carried out the undertakings he gave at the commencement of the Session with regard to this Bill, and they were consequently very loth to divide the House upon any question which they did not think was of material importance. He failed to see why the Government had refused to adopt, at any rate, the principle of the clause moved by his hon. friend. It suggested the cheapest and the most expeditious method of acquiring land in Ireland for the purposes of restoration, and it was an absolutely safe process from the Treasury point of view. It simply suggested that where land was offered the Government should acquire it if, in the opinion of the Estates Commissioners, acting upon the report of their inspectors, it was considered to be good security for the money asked for it. No compulsory powers were asked for in such a case. In the past, although the Estates Commissioners had considered the figure at which land was offered them perfectly reasonable, they had not had power to act, with the result that land which was suitable for restoring the evicted tenants had passed into the hands of large graziers who gave no employment whatsoever to the inhabitants. He hoped the Chief Secretary would be able to do something to meet their wishes in this direction.

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that before the debate closed he was anxious to say a few words in regard to the position of the Opposition and also to repeat in a slightly varied form the objections he had to urge against the policy of His Majesty's Government. He did not as a rule complain of the criticism of his opponents, but he thought he had every reason to complain of the violence and the taste of the attack made upon his colleagues and himself by the hon. Member for South Belfast. The violence of his language was certainly not equalled by anything which came from hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, and it would have been in better taste and more in conformity with the usual practice of those who generally acted together, if the hon. Member had contented himself with explaining his own position without thinking it necessary to ascribe to others motives for which there was not the smallest foundation. He had stated more than once that so far as the reinstatement of the evicted tenants went, they were anxious that it should be carried out, and when that declaration was followed by a criticism of the measure the Government had produced they were told the one indicated the insincerity of the other. He entirely denied that statement. It was absurd, it was almost immoral, to tell any body of men that in any great question they were to be governed by the doctrine that the end justified the means. There was no other argument by which the charge against the Unionist Party could be established.

To lay down as a proposition against which there was no answer that because they were in favour of the reinstatement of the evicted tenants, and had been since the Act of 1903, they were therefore to give their approval and support to any measure the Government saw fit to introduce to carry out that object, was to seek to establish a rule which would operate immediately against hon. Members opposite, and one which when in Opposition they had not endeavoured to apply to themselves. He recalled many measures produced by the late Government to attain objects which had many supporters on the other side, but which were opposed by hon. Members opposite with all the vehemence they could command because they disapproved of the method adopted. Nobody who had made the most elementary study of the agrarian question in Ireland, especially in its more recent developments since the passing of the Act of 1903, could be ignorant of the fact that the reinstatement of a certain number of the evicted tenants was a matter of the greatest importance. It was natural that men who were living within sight of their old homes, and who believed, and he thought justly in some cases, that they were evicted not for sins on their own part, but because they held a particular view and had accepted particular advice, should view with feelings of the profoundest dissatisfaction and dislike other people living in the homes that once were theirs. In these cases there could be no two opinions as to the desirability of reinstatement. He did not deny that there were many cases which, though they could not be described in similar language, were closely allied to these; and, therefore, as to a large number of the evicted tenants, there had never been any difference of opinion as to the desirbility of reinstatement. The present question, however, was not whether it was desirable or not to reinstate evicted tenants. It was only in a minor degree as to the method by which the evicted tenants were to be selected. It was a much larger question. It was the method and machinery by which the policy of reinstatement was to be carried out, and because the Unionist Party had criticised and opposed this Bill it was not either just or fair to say that they were in consequence to be held to be opposed to the reinstatement of these people. They had asked repeatedly what was the need of a Bill of this kind, and had never had any satisfactory reply from the Government. They had raised the case of the new tenants and had argued, he thought, with great force and justice, that the way in which they were to be treated was altogether indefensible. The answer of the Government had been that in the majority of cases the new tenants were not bound to their holdings by ties of affection; that they had not established for themselves a reputation as stable and successful tenant farmers; and that therefore they would be glad for themselves, and for certain social reasons to which the Attorney-General had referred, to be removed. Out of 3,000 men qualified to be reinstated, over 1,000 had been provided for under the existing law; and that number had been considerably increased under private arrangements, such as that on Lord Masserene's estate, where a settlement had been brought about by methods satisfactory to all concerned, and highly creditable to that noble Lord and to those who had assisted him. What proof was there that compulsion in any form was needed? He was not, however, an idealist; he was a practical politician—at least he hoped so—and he would be foolish indeed, and quite oblivious of all that was going on, if he expected His Majesty's present advisers to produce any measure dealing with land which did not contain compulsory powers to be used against the present owners. He quite realised it would be desiring the impossible to expect the present Government not to have included some measure of compulsion in their Bill. He went further and admitted that there were undoubtedly circumstances in which it might be necessary to introduce the element of compulsion to secure the end in view. In the general legislation of this country the element of compulsion had often been found necessary in order to provide for the requirements of the community. He was not so unreasonable as to deny that compulsion should be established where necessary. Nor did the bulk of those with whom he generally acted object to the introduction of compulsory powers where necessary. This had been recognised in public health legislation and in railway Bills. But there was no case of that kind which could be compared with the compulsory powers now proposed. The Government had never established the necessity for, or justified the introduction of a form of compulsion more extreme and unjust than anything which the law at present knew. Under the form of compulsion proposed the authority charged with administering the Bill would exercise it in their own way, withdrawn from public criticism, and without any reasonable opportunity being given to those affected to present their case. He held that in this matter, as in others, where compulsory powers were exercised compulsion ought to be preceded by inquiry on the spot, open and public in its character, which could be attended by all the parties interested. The absence of such an inquiry was the greatest, but not the only, blot on the system of compulsion proposed by the Government. It was justly complained that the same tribunal was to be judge and jury, and to perform a variety of conflicting functions, while nothing was to be urged by those who suffered under the Bill. He did not know whether it was too late to plead again with the Chief Secretary for a revision of this part of the Bill. It was in the interests of the passage of the measure, in the interest of the Government themselves, and of those on whose heavily laden shoulders they were placing this burden, that they should still consider whether there might not be some appeal from the decision of the Estates Commissioners. It would lead to the more successful working of the measure if the Government would consider the separation of the functions of fixing the value and effecting the purchase. The Opposition had been accused of pressing the case of the new tenants too hard; but he thought that if the Government had made up their minds to get rid of the new tenants they would have been better advised to offer them a good sum of money than to deal with them by the provisions now existing in the Bill. It was proposed to find new farms for those who were to be dispossessed in order that the evicted tenants might be reinstated. This would create a social difficulty, not only as great as that which they were trying to remedy, but, he believed greater. There would be the greatest possible difficulty in finding a farm suitable for the new tenant who was to be removed from his holding. If it had been decided that the new tenants were only to be moved into holdings which they regarded as satisfactory he would not have had a word to say; but there was no condition of that kind attached. Here again everything rested entirely on the discretion of the Estates Commissioners, and he believed that, in its limited and partial form, it would add to rather than lessen the feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction which the Government said they were anxious to allay. He wanted to say a word on behalf of the occupying owner—the man who had been called upon to evict his tenant, not for the causes which led to the eviction of the Plan of Campaign tenants, but for other causes altogether, which appeared perfectly satisfactory to the owner. There were many cases where the owner, after losing the rents due to him, had decided to take the land into his own hands and had made a satisfactory and productive holding. What was the prospect of that man? He stood to be shot at like every other man who had done his duty by the land. He stood a chance under this Bill of having that land taken from him compulsorily, and of losing, not only the arrears of rent, but all the capital he had expended and the return he expected to get out of the land which he had put into good heart as the result of his own prudent and wise expenditure. These men, who had been a blessing to their neighbourhood, ought not, in the interests of fair play, to be interfered with as they would be under the provisions of the Bill. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER, "How many are there?"] He entirely denied the opportuneness of that interruption. He was arguing a case of justice, and justice was not less important whether the cases were few or numerous. To argue that this claim was to be ignored because the number was few was preposterous. He did not know what the number was, but he believed it was greater than the hon. Gentleman appeared to think. In effecting this great land revolution and turning occupiers into owners, it was of primary importance that they should keep in the country a certain number of those who had the skill, the capital, and the social advantages which enabled them to set a good example, and to do the pioneer work so beneficial in every agricultural community if the standard of agriculture was to be kept at a high level. Therefore, he said these men had a claim on the attention of the House, not only because of the justice of their case, but also because they were playing an important part, and must play a more important part, in the agricultural history of Ireland. He hoped that even now the Government would consider whether they could not be specially safeguarded and saved from interference, because interference with them would injure the cause the Government had themselves at heart—namely, the advancement of the general agricultural prosperity of the country. There was a detail to which, he thought, the Government had not paid sufficient atention, and he hoped that even at the eleventh hour they might see their way to effect an alteration. He did not think the House had realised what the possible effect of the Bill might be to a landlord whose land was taken, in regard to the cost of the operation. Admitting the simplicity—he thought even the barbarous simplicity—of the scheme of the Government, considerable cost must attach to carrying it out. He asked the Government to consider the position of the man whose land might be taken. Land might be taken from a man who had never had any difficulty with or evicted any of his tenants. Was it fair to take this man's land for a public purpose and against his will, and, because he happened to put on it a higher price than the authorised purchaser put on it, and resisted the methods of the Government, expose him to the risk of being called upon, not only to lose his land, but also to pay a heavy sum for the expenditure incurred in the operation? The Government ought to provide that whatever costs were incurred by the operation should be borne by the State. He wished to say one word as to Clause 12, under which the *status* of the Estates Commissioners was to be altered. That Amendment was introduced under the closure, and by it the Government had made a very serious change, giving the Commissioners the *status* of County Court Judges. During Committee he received both from the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General a definite assurance that it was not the intention of the Government to remove the Commissioners from the area of criticism by the House of Commons. Under Section 3 of the Act of 1903 power was given to the Lord-Lieutenant to issue regulations for the guidance of the Commissioners. Was there any precedent in history for giving men the *status* of Judges and then saying they were to be guided by regulations made by the Executive Government? That was a startling change, and he could not help thinking that it had been done by mistake. He could not but think that the Government had not intended to keep in the hands of the Executive the right to guide these gentlemen in their work, and that their intention was to complete the change by repealing the sub-section of the Act of 1903. If that was the case, what became of the assurance that the Commissioners would be subject to the criticism of Parliament? If they were made judges they would be told that as judges they were removed from the criticism of the House of Commons. If that sub-section went, the Government would be exposed to the charge that the pledge given in Committee had not been carried out. He was not one of those who believed they could go on saying the same thing, that however good it might be, over and over again, but he must enter this *caveat*, that it must not be contended that, because they did not criticise at that stage all the parts of the Bill to which they objected, their objections had been in any way removed. The Bill was novel in its methods and machinery, and drastic in the way in which it was going to affect a great industry in Ireland, and it had been discussed in circumstances which he believed were abhorrent to the majority of Members of the House, for they had not been able to discuss many parts of the Bill at all. He regretted very much that it had not been found possible to provide a little more time which would have enabled the Government to carry the Bill without resorting to the drastic measures they had adopted, because the Bill would now go forth from the House only partially discussed in some parts and in others not at all. It was to be sent forth as a message of peace, to remove a great difficulty which stood in the way of progress and peace in Ireland. If he had thought the Bill was calculated to serve those ends he would have done anything he could, according to his conscience, to support it; but he did not believe that an end, however admirable, was to be attained by means in themselves improper. So far from believing that this measure was the right way to solve the difficulty with which they had to deal, he believed it was likely to complicate and add to it. He thought the Government had made a mistake in postponing the natural working of the Act of 1903, and he could only regard this as a measure which had been too hastily conceived, which introduced principles unjust and without precedent, and which in regard to its machinery was in some parts unworkable and in others workable only if the people concerned were willing to sacrifice their interests to those of the community at large.

Mr. BIRRELL said the right hon. Gentleman, in his clear and straightforward and admirable speech, had made it pretty plain—and, indeed, he thought it was the only thing that had been made plain during these prolonged discussions—that the difference between the Government and, he would not say the whole of the Party opposite, but the majority of them, was a difference, not of principle, but of machinery and detail. The right hon. Gentleman had always most candidly told the House that in his opinion the reinstatement of the evicted tenants was a question which might fairly and ought to engage the attention of everybody responsible for law and order in Ireland; in other words, that it was a real question and a question not dependent on Party interests or altogether on the merits of the evicted tenants, or even on their character—a question arising out of a political issue, out of a social movement, and largely out of legislation which the House had approved. Therefore, all of them, and especially those who were charged with the conduct of affairs, were charged with the duty of dealing with some reasonable degree of speed with this question. The right hon. Gentleman had gone a little further than some of his followers, because he had said that he was not averse to the application of the principle of compulsion in certain cases. Assuming that it was necessary that it should be applied, the right hon. Gentleman would not rigorously hold out against it, and he thought he was right in saying that, so far as the right hon. Gentleman was concerned, and certainly so far as those persons who were primarily responsible for and desired to see peace and prosperity in Ireland were concerned, they were agreed that something must be done. The objections to the Bill related rather to methods and machinery than to anything else. That being so, it seemed to him very unfortunate that the time allotted to this measure in Committee—three and a half days—should not have been devoted—he was making no charge against hon. Gentlemen opposite; all Oppositions were alike—to methods and machinery and detail instead of to arguing over and over again what he conceived to be the general principle lying at the bottom of the Bill. There was the question of an appeal. They never got to that question at all.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): That was because of the guillotine.

Mr. BIRRELL said that if there was any man who abhorred the guillotine it was he. It took out of a man all the fight and fettle and interest in his own measure. He did not care a bit about it. He came to the House bored to death. He knew the Opposition would take good care never to get to the most critical parts of the Bill, that he would never be called upon to do anything more than defend over and over again its general principles, which he had off by heart, which admitted of rotund sentences which flowed easily from the lips of most people, however small their natural capacity. There were, perhaps, parts of his measure which might be attacked by good arguments and could only be defended upon a balance of arguments. In such circumstances the Minister knew that his chance of achieving anything like a real success, not dependent on votes in the lobby, was to show fair-minded men that the balance of argument was in his favour. That was a task any man might be proud to undertake, and if he occasionally failed he would have the consolation of knowing that he had been engaged in a pursuit which was not unworthy of his past education. Upon that Bill, however, nothing had been done but to discuss over and over again Second Reading speeches and considerations. Now, on the Third Reading, hon. Members had brought forward those very questions which they most carefully avoided raising on the Committee stage. He could not reach the avenues of the minds of Gentlemen opposite for the purposes of debate in that House. They were blocked against him. But they must know perfectly well that, if they had not had some other object in their minds than useful criticism of the Bill, they would have been able in three days and a half, provided they had forborne from repeating Second Reading considerations, to discuss—[Cries of "No" from Mr. LONSDALE and Sir F. BANBURY.] Then he gave it up. There were some half-a-dozen Gentlemen opposite not personally interested in the discussion who had heard the greater part of the debate—a large number very wisely stayed away; he appealed to those half-dozen spectators without hesitation as to whether three days and a half in Committee was not ample time for a Bill of that sort. If it was not, it was hopeless ever to think of using the House of Commons for the purposes of detailed criticism of a measure. He would have preferred that the Bill should have been properly discussed in detail, though it would have placed a far longer intellectual burden upon him than had been cast upon him by discussions which he would not characterise—he would not say anything rude. The measure was one in regard to which their differences were differences of machinery and method rather than of principle. The greater part of the time, however, had been spent in discussing the principle until now, rather late in the day, some valuable suggestions had been put forward. The Bill could not be worse in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman now than it was on its introduction. Though the alterations in it had not been very great, they had been in the direction of meeting the views of Gentlemen opposite. The right hon. Gentleman had made an impassioned speech, of a kind familiar to him as a lawyer, about costs. There was an eminent Judge who declared that first came costs, then law, and then merits. He had no great admiration for the Lands Clauses Act; it had proved a burden on the industries of the country. He, however, still agreed with the view of the Lands Clauses Act upon the question of costs. If a man's lands were taken from him compulsorily in the public interest we ought not to require him to put his hand into his pocket to pay any of the cost of appearing before the tribunal, whether his opposition was reasonable or unreasonable. If he chose to employ learned gentlemen he had a right to do so, though he could probably do the work much better himself. The matter involved no law, but had reference to the value of his land, the amenity of his estate, his own comfort, and other considerations which he was in a position to represent with greater force than any one else. Still he was entitled to have his costs, and a clause had been inserted in the Bill for that purpose, in which it was provided that the costs were to be taxed.

MR. ASHLEY: Does that include proving the title?

MR. BIRRELL said it included any costs that were necessarily and properly incurred. If the clause would pass muster among the celebrated and distinguished authorities in another place, the Government had no objection to words being inserted with a view to carrying out its intention. The right hon. Gentleman's other point was about the tenure of the Estates Commissioners under Section 12. The meaning of Section 12 was that they should hold office by the same tenure as County Court Judges, simply, that was to say, with regard to their removability. It was not intended that their salaries should be taken off the Votes or that they themselves should not be subject to the full criticism of that House. The tenure of a County Court Judge had the advantage of being a safer tenure, but he would never propose that the salaries of the Commissioners should be removed from the consideration of the House. Commissioner Wrench had a salary that was placed on the Consolidated Fund, and so, in order to subject him to criticism, he was paid £500 a year more. He agreed that it would be a very absurd and lamentable thing if the Estates Commissioners were to be invested with the particular character of Judges which would prevent their being fairly criticised in that House. He was there to defend them, which was not the case with the Judges. It was possible to communicate with them, to argue with them, to persuade them, and to exercise whatever reasonable pressure the head of a department could bring to bear. He still thought he could discover no better tribunal than the three Estates Commissioners for the purpose of carrying out this measure. It had been said that it would have been better to follow the precedent of the Labourers Act. Under that Act land was taken compulsorily for the purpose of building cottages, and the Local Government Board appointed a single arbitrator. Supposing it had been suggested that he should appoint a single arbitrator to fix the value of the land, he did not think hon. Gentlemen opposite would have accepted the proposal. He would not have cared to suggest it. These three gentlemen were much better fitted to fix the value of land for the limited purposes of this measure than a single arbitrator, sometimes one man, sometimes another. He would shrink from appointing a single arbitrator. He would know very little about him to start with; and after he had appointed him he would hear all sorts of stories about his past life. He would not undertake the responsibility of suggesting that in a case of this sort the House should follow the example of the Labourers Acts. He still thought that these three persons were for the purpose the best that could be named. As some reference had been made to the evidence that Mr. Finucane gave before Lord Dudley's Commission, he would like to point out what was said by this blameless Anglo-Indian who had been represented as a person who had introduced into Ireland the most extreme Oriental ideas, who had not been educated in the spirit of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, and who could do almost anything if the public service required it. He found that Mr. Finucane expressed this view before the Commission, that—

> "The owner was entitled to receive, and the State should give, a full and generous price which should yield the vendor the normal income he had received from the land during the preceding five or ten years."

He did not think that a man possessing views of that sort could be accused of entertaining wild and rash ideas as to the sanctity of property. Not a single acre of the 81,000 which were supposed to be required under the Act would be paid for at anything less than its fair market value. He could not read in the Bill or see in its provisions the least desire to do that. His only fear—well, he would not say fear—but his belief was that they would probably get more from the Estate Commissioners than they would be able to get in the open market. He not ask the landlords to submit themselves to be robbed; nobody did. He thought, however, having regard to all that had been done for them by this Parliament and by the Act of 1903, that they had done better than they expected. He did not quarrel with them for that, because a bargain was a bargain, and he would not go back upon it. He thought, having regard to the terms on which the Act of 1903 became law, and to the fact that it contained what was believed to be a generous provision for these very evicted tenants—of course voluntarily, because the whole scheme was voluntary—that they would not have got that measure had it not been believed, perhaps too readily and too sanguinely, that the question was going to be settled in a comparatively short time. Therefore he did not think it was too much to ask the Irish landlords that they should throw themselves into the matter and do their very best to fulfil all the promises and statements made by the noble Lord who had moved the rejection of the Bill in a singularly reasonable and admirable speech. He had not a word to say against that speech, and he would like due effect to be given to it. The British taxpayer had got to play his part; and they asked the landlords to play theirs. After all, the evicted tenants had not had such a good time of it during the last twenty-five years. Their case had been submitted to a pretty close examination and a considerable number had been eliminated from the list. The Estate Commissioners had rejected a considerable number, some on the ground of old age, some on the ground of poverty, some on account of their bad habits, and some because they would not be likely to thrive upon the land. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had drawn an awful picture as to the amount of pressure that would be exercised upon somebody or other. Well, a man in Ireland must resist pressure. That was all. He had to resist it. It was all very well for hon. Members to say they knew of a number of cases where he yielded. They did not know of the number of cases where he resisted. He dared say that if they were in his place, they would yield more than he did, though he did not say they would yield to the same people. Whatever Party in the State was in power, the person who occupied the position he occupied would at all events try and do his best in the matter, and when pressure was put upon him he must resist it if he thought honour demanded that he should. He was not going to admit that the hon. Member for the University of Cambridge was right in saying that almost every one of the people who had already been rejected would renew their claims and renew them in such a way as to make it almost impossible for the Estates Commissioners in the first instance or for the Chief Secretary or for the Government to resist their demands to be reinstated. He did not think that was so, and he regretted the somewhat scanning and nagging spirit in which a few Members, but by no means all, had received the measure. He thought the measure should have been treated as one which excluded a number of people, but excluded them for good reasons. He thought people should have said they would do their best, and that they would give the measure their support. It was an honest attempt to solve a difficult problem. He dared say that it would give rise to some dissatisfaction. Hon. Members opposite always assumed in one half of their speeches that the evicted tenants should be reinstated, but in the other half of their speeches they always wiped that assumption out. Assuming that the evicted tenants were to be reinstated, a measure of this kind could not be weighed nicely by the scale of gold. They had to take some rough-and-ready scheme. The tenants to be reinstated had to be those evicted before 1903, they had to give in their claim before May 18th, and their claims had to be investigated. A great number had been investigated. They had got to do their best, and it might require some courage to maintain their attitude. They had finally to limit the number to be reinstated, and there were very few cases outstanding. He did not wish to shut the gates of mercy on anybody, but at the same time they intended to limit the number, and they would have done so before the month was over. They had for the first time ascertained the dimensions of the problem, and it was larger than anybody thought. There was nothing unusual or unnatural in that. They now at all events knew the number and the acreage that would probably be required, and really the only question was whether they ought to apply the principle of compulsion at all. Everybody agreed that in certain cases—on the Clanricarde Estate, for instance—unless they had compulsion they would fail. He did not think they had enough untenanted land at their disposal to devote to this purpose without injuring a cause which, apart from historical, political, and social reasons, was the more important of the two. He at all events could not be blamed for this circumstance, or have heaped upon his head the whole inherited history of Ireland. He did not wish in any way to take away land which was necessary to increase holdings so as to make them economic in order that people might live and thrive upon them. He really thought the time had come when it was necessary to have the compulsory powers this Bill offered. He felt certain that if they had not been included the measure would have hung fire for a great number of years and would have delayed the settlement of a question which everybody who knew anything about Ireland felt ought to be settled. They therefore felt it was necessary to take these compulsory powers. They took the Estates Commissioners, not because they considered them an ideal Court, but because they were a good Court for the limited purpose of the Bill, which was to fix the value of land. That was not a legal question and did not raise nice points and questions such as could be taken to the House of Commons. It was simply to say what was a fair price to pay a man for thirty or forty acres of land. Having the Estates Commissioners ready with all the accumulated knowledge they had acquired, they thought that on the whole they should give them the powers. The other courses which had been suggested were the setting up of an Arbitrator and proceeding under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, which, in the last resort, meant handing the matter over to a jury. He therefore thought they were acting in the interests of the landlords themselves, and that they could not do better than appoint the Estates Commissioners as the tribunal. In an ideal state of society he did not think there would ever be an end to appeal. He could assure the House that lawyers who had pushed their case to appeal and lost in the House of Lords never went away convinced that that was an end of all things in the Court of Eternal Justice. They would be quite prepared, if there was another Court, to take it up to it. In considering the necessity for appeal they had to consider really what were the points at issue. The point might become of such importance that an appeal was necessary. He was quite content to say that in matters of the utmost importance affecting life and property in a real and material sense they might have one, two, or three appeals, but in a question of this sort, a question as to value, again and again fixed by a single arbitrator without appeal, he held it was unnecessary to insist upon appeal and to demand such appeal in the name of eternal justice as the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone did the other day. Indeed, the noble Lord appeared to think that eternal justice and the Lands Clauses Acts were one and the same thing. His answer to the noble Lord was that, considering the nature of the case to which the principles were to be applied, and it being a question whether they were to give £20 or £25 an acre for land, they really thought, assuming that they secured an honest tribunal and an impartial tribunal so far as anybody could be impartial, they were doing what was required. He had been an umpire himself, and he knew exactly how much importance to attach to expert evidence on one side or the other. Though not an expert on the value of land, he came to a conclusion, which never afterwards rested heavily upon his conscience, because he was certain that within a few pounds one way or the other he gave a very good sound judgment. He had no reason to suppose that the Estates Commissioners would not be able to form a good, sound, sensible, business-like view as to the value of land in the various parts of Ireland. To evoke the principles of eternal justice and to speak in the impassioned language of some hon. Gentlemen opposite, as if Irish landlords were to be despoiled and ill-treated, was to apply to a matter of this sort, which ought to be a philanthropic business, language of great exaggeration, and he was perfectly satisfied that this tribunal, even without a Court of Appeal, would do substantial justice in Ireland. One word about the new tenants or planters. There, he quite agreed, they must act cautiously and warily. He had said repeatedly that there were new tenants whom to turn out would be a gross injustice. He would not say he had any particular estate or planter in his mind at the moment, but imagination had played around him. The Leader of the Opposition had described him living on his farm, begetting his children on the place, with all his affections crowded round the spot, and popular with all around him. Well, he quite agreed that that man should not be turned out. But how did the hon. Gentleman wish to meet such a case? He could not put all these rhetorical phrases into the Bill, and he could not by the exercise of any language restrict the discretion of the Estates Commissioners even in favour of men of this description. Everybody recognised that there were a considerable number whom it would be improper to turn out, but everyone recognised that a great many would be glad to go. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University made a suggestion that there should be no alternative farms offered at all. That was a matter well worthy of consideration, but he thought in the case of persons who were really farmers they would prefer to get the alternative offer. They might say they had not been happy where they were, but that having been farmers all their lives they did not want to be turned off the soil by being paid a sum of money. They might say they would sooner be treated as farmers and get a place somewhere else. He thought a man should have a choice between a farm and a sum of money. If he preferred the farm he should have it, or if he preferred the money he could take that. He therefore thought there was no injustice in it unless they assumed that the Estates Commissioners were going round to turn out people irrespective of every other circumstance of the case. He declined to put in any words which would restrict their discretion in the matter, because there might be one or two cases where it would be desirable in the interests of law and order in a neighbourhood that a man should go. He did not know of any such case, but there might be one or two and they would have full and cautious consideration. He had introduced the Bill, not because of the rejection of the Irish Council Bill—they were always hearing that, and it was supposed to give him great pain, but he could assure hon. Gentleman opposite they might try to prick him with that barbed answer as long as they pleased and he would not claim the martyr's crown. This Bill had nothing whatever to do with the Irish Council Bill or its rejection by the Convention. It was brought in in consequence of a pledge given by him at the early part of the session. He had fulfilled that pledge to the best of his ability, and he thought that the measure, even if it passed into law without any further discussion, which, of course, it would not, because it would be considered in another place, would do good to Ireland, be an act of justice, and, if they liked, of generosity, and contribute to make the task of those who succeeded him easier.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 228 ; Noes, 49. (Division List, No. 371).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt. Hn.HerbertHenry
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone, N.
Bell, Richard
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Rt. Hn.SirJ.T.(Chesh.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt.Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dickinson,W.H.(St. Pancras,N.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grayson, Allbert Victor
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.

Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvon)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murphy, N. J. (Kilkenny, S.)
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards,T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (HawickB.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, John Henry (Halifax
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. A. J. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn.Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord E. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hills, J. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin, S.
Londsale, John Brownlee
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson, W. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey) said he desired to move that this Bill be read a second time that day three months. Everybody had at heart the object sought to be carried out by this Bill, but they objected to the way in which the President of the Local Government Board proposed to achieve that object. Those who read the Bill could not avoid seeing the drastic change that was contemplated by it. It proposed to take out of the hands of Parliament and give to the Local Government Board the whole control, and all foods except drugs and all drink except water were to be covered by regulations of the Local Government Board. There was no suggestion that those regulations should be laid before Parliament or laid upon the Table or inquired into by the various trades affected, and therefore he thought it was his duty to oppose the Bill. For years he had been interested in the administration of the public health, and he knew how seriously this Bill would affect it. It was the most anti-democratic measure that had been introduced into the House of Commons in modern times. It was such a Bill as one might have expected an administrative autocracy to bring in, but not a democratic Government. It took out of the hands of the people the control of all these large trades, and although the President of the Local Government Board might say he was responsible for everything that was done, the people's representatives in the House of Commons were deprived of any opportunity of discussing the action of the Local Government Board. A large number of Members would like to do so, and even if they had such an opportunity there would be very little chance of discussing the question. He regretted that the Government had not devoted the time that they had employed on the Army Bill to a Public Health Bill to preserve life instead of utilising the time to pass a Bill to destroy life. In such a Bill the whole of these subjects might be dealt with by Parliament and not by the Local Government Board. The work of this Bill might have been put into a Public Health Bill. Such a Bill had stood upon the Paper all through the session, and yet at the far end of the session this Bill was brought up. It was hardly the proper way of dealing with the question. The Bill dealt with a trade of £300,000,000 or £400,000,000. The meat trade alone came to £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 a month, and that meat was to be inspected directly it came into the country. The machinery necessary must be large and expensive, and he thought they ought to know something about that machinery before the Bill was passed. The same thing might be said of all other interests bound up in the Bill. The Bill not only made the regulations but gave power to the Local Government Board to modify Acts of Parliament already passed, which was a most extraordinary power to give to a Government Department. That alone ought to give rise to a very serious consideration of the Bill. It was for these reasons that he declined to give the powers proposed to the Local Government Board. He knew what the inspectors of meat in England were. Many of them were not properly trained and their work was done by rule of thumb. In Germany the inspector of meat had to be either a veterinary surgeon or a surgeon, and to have two years special training. On all these grounds and with the desire of giving the House some opportunity of discussing the Bill, which he did not desire should slip through without some debate, he begged to move the Motion standing in his name.

*MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) said he seconded the Motion not so much upon the intrinsic demerits of the Bill as because of the want of conciliation on the part of the President of the Local Government Board who had brought it forward. He regarded the Bill as one of the most drastic of the session. Notwithstanding this fact, the President of the Local Government Board had placed every obstacle in the way of Motions being placed upon the Paper, asking that the regulations in the Bill might be laid before the House. The Bill was based on an Act which dealt with cholera and epidemics and which was only used on special occasions. Notice had to be given of the regulations under that Act before they came into force. In 1896 another Public Health Act was passed and the powers of the authorities were further extended and handed over to the Local Government Board. That Act dealt with the regulations of port authorities. It dealt with the case of disease on board vessels coming into ports. The powers which had been handed over to the Local Government Board required that in that case also consent had to be obtained and notice given to the public before the regulations became operative. Consent had to be obtained from the Customs authorities and from the Admiralty, and notice had to be given to the public of that consent. This Bill was an extension of both those Acts, but the extraordinary thing about it was that the Local Government Board had to give no notice to anyone as to the regulations they were to make. They were to deal with all the articles of food and drink of the people without giving any notice to the people or to the trades affected. He thought that such regulations should be laid before both Houses of Parliament for forty days before they came into effect.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'this day three months.'"—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said he asked the House to give a Second Reading to this simple, useful, necessary, and in his judgment too long delayed measure. At the outset he wished to state what were the deficiencies in the law as it now was, and the reason and justification for the Government asking that this Bill should be passed into law to make good those deficiencies. The Government asked that the Local Government Board should have power to extend the duties it now enjoyed under the Act of 1875, as set out in the Bill now under consideration. Perhaps in the light of what had recently been said, he might state what the law was with regard to the condition, the preparation, storage, and distribution of human food which was peculiarly liable to become unsound. The Public Health Act empowered the Medical Officer for Health or Inspector of Nuisances to examine meat or other articles of food if exposed for sale or deposited for the purposes of sale or in course of preparation for sale, if intended for the food of man. If it appeared to the Medical Officer or the Inspector of Nuisances that meat or any form of food was diseased, unsound, unwholesome, or unfit for food, he might seize, carry away, examine and bring the case before a magistrate. If the magistrate was satisfied, the food might be condemned and a penalty inflicted on the vendor or any person on whose premises the food so condemned was found. To many people who had not closely studied the question, the law was quite sufficient; but unfortunately it was not, because an Inspector was unable to deal with any food so long as it was not, in the language of the Act, "exposed for sale for human consumption." The Public Health Acts gave no control over the arrangement or preparation of food or the cleanliness of the receptacles in which it was contained. The House would perhaps permit him to give an illustration. A certain firm whose name he would not mention exported a large quantity of tinned meat from England to South Africa. That meat was sound, clean, healthy and well packed. It went to South Africa and lay there for two or three years. It was moved from pillar to post, following the troops wherever they went. But a considerable proportion of it was not used, and at the end of the war it was sold. It had so bad a reputation in South Africa that no one would think of touching it. It was shipped to England and arrived at a certain port with a view to its being sold and circulated in this country. It was in a shocking condition, but it could not be touched at the port were it was landed because it was not exposed for sale. It was transported by rail to London, and it could not be touched in the goods yard for the same reason. To their credit, the firm who originally prepared and sold it, who of course were not responsible for the condition into which it had fallen, seeing that if that food, bearing their name, packed in their tins and packages, was put upon the market and sold, their reputation would suffer enormously, informed the Local Government Board of the circumstance. The Local Government Board had no power to seize the food, but the result was that the Board with the co-operation of one or two people succeeded in persuading the person who bought this unsound food to sacrifice his prospective profit, and the stuff was condemned and destroyed. The Local Government Board ought not to be put in that position. When large quantities of condemned stores were known to be unsound and it was known by the port sanitary authority that an endeavour was being made to put them upon the market the Local Government Board ought to be in a position to stop them.

MR. WATT: They were sold to this person.

MR. JOHN BURNS said they were sold as condemned stores, and the man knew perfectly well that he would not have got them at the price he did if they had not been unsound. The medical officer or port sanitary authority ought to have the power to seize and condemn such things. If that was not done, these bad stores were sold to retailers of food, who were in many cases persuaded that they were in good condition or were not so unsound as to be objectionable to the palates of their customers. But the chief evil was that an honest tradesman was induced to purchase them for a small price. He exposed them for sale, the sanitary officer came along and seized the goods, and this unfortunate man was taken before a magistrate and fined for selling things which he should have had no opportunity of selling. A fine or perhaps imprisonment was the result. That was bad enough, but worse still was the fact that this perfectly honest tradesman who had been trapped into this, had his reputation so affected that if he was able to pay the fine, he was not able to outlive the unsavoury reputation which he had acquired as a seller of bad food, and he was either absolutely ruined or had to remove to another place. To show the necessity for these powers he might say that in 1872 tinned meat to the extent of about 14 lbs. per head of the population was imported into this country, and that in 1902 the importation had grown to 56 lbs. per head. £40,000,000 worth of food was imported yearly into this country. Half that food came from the United States, and the great bulk of that half came from a particular city. The Local Government Board desired under this Bill to obtain powers to prevent danger arising to the public health from the importation of tinned foods. Tinned food made from unwholesome articles could, save in exceptional cases, now be detected, but only two port sanitary authorities had power to deal effectively with this food on landing. Those two were London and Manchester. This Bill proposed to put all port sanitary authorities in the same position as those of London and Manchester, of being able to take samples of such food and destroy it where necessary. The regulation would also require satisfactory evidence of the antecedents of the food such as were demanded by Germany, Denmark, and other continental countries. The authorities would insist upon knowing the conditions under which food was prepared, especially sausages, brawn, and other articles consumed mainly in the poorer districts. It would insist upon the provision of clean and decent places where food had to be stored. It would provide, for example, that ice cream under process of preservation should not be kept under or in a bed or near a lavatory. It would insist that in the process of distributing food the receptacles, wagons, and other means of transport should be kept cleaner than they now were. It would enable many of the abominations which prevailed in all parts of the country to be stopped, and indeed the conditions under which food was prepared and distributed would be so improved as to be an advantage to the food trade, while conferring a protection upon honest traders in the difficulties which now surrounded them. If the House would permit him he would give one or two reasons, quite apart from the desire of the Local Government Board, for this Bill. He had before him the report of a man who very properly enjoyed the respect and good opinion of all who knew him. He referred to the medical officer for Finsbury, Dr. Newman, who was the author of that excellent work entitled "Infant Mortality" and who had given many years study to dietetics. Dr. Newman stated—

> "Much imported meat is actually diseased and especially does this apply to offal and veal

even when it is received from such countries as Holland, where more or less inspection takes place. For instance, from 1901–5 in Finsbury, in addition to a large quantity of damaged and decomposed veal and offal, we confiscated 213 carcases of veal, 150 carcases of pork, and 40,486 sheep's and pigs' plucks, all of which were diseased, and none of which bore evidences of inspection."

He wished to supplement that by saying that this was food the medical officer was able to condemn with his limited powers, and yet had it been placed in wagons and transported from Finsbury to Battersea it could not have been stopped, because in the words of the Act, "it was not exposed for sale for human consumption." The Report went on to say that two van loads of tinned so-called beef and sausage were found to be in a very bad condition; some of the tins had been pricked to let the gas out, and then re-soldered. The contents when analysed were discovered to consist not of beef but of horse flesh from Hamburg. Now they could realise what became of the poor old horses shipped from England to Hamburg, and sold there for about £1 or 30s.; they came back after an interval to this country in the form of canned foods of every description. He was glad to think that the City Corporation and the local authorities were strongly in favour of this Bill. He had received no complaint against it; on the contrary, he had been strongly urged to press it forward. He would give another case. Dr. Collingridge, the medical officer for the City of London, said that in December, 1906, 11,000 tons of mixed food were seized. He tested seventy or eighty tins, the contents of which he found in every case to be unwholesome, some were putrid, even rotten, and some were saturated with tin: it was solely in consequence of the liquid that came from the tins that they were examined. If the importers only knew how deficient were the powers of medical officers in this matter, he feared that much more of this stuff would get into circulation. He had a quotation from the Report of the Medical Officer of Health for Marylebone, dealing with the kind of thing this Bill was intended to prevent—

> "The chief fault lay in the American brawns; six samples of brawn derived from Chicago were filthy, containing dirt, bits of straw, woody fibre, hair, hogs' bristles, shreds of skin with the bristles attached, and other matters, giving one the impression that some portion of the contents was made by floor sweepings."

Again, the Chairman of the Public Health Committee of the London County Council said—

> "In Paddington there had been seized five tons of diseased meat, much of which consisted of liver filled with parasites and abscesses;

while as to Finsbury they were told

> "that in the five years since it became a borough, 376 tons of meat had been seized and confiscated."

One report spoke of a business in prepared food being carried on without the inspector knowing anything about it, the reason being that the law as it now stood did not empower the inspector to go where he could get information. He did not think it necessary to give further instances showing the enormous amount of diseased and unsound meat which got through. It would be sufficient to quote one authority, and that was the *Lancet*, which deserved great praise for the way in which it pressed the Government to do something in this matter. In a leading article in June last, it said—

> "The trade in diseased meat and putrid milk, to say nothing of adulterated food-stuffs, will never be put an end to until the offenders are treated as the poisoners which they really are."

He could give instance after instance to prove the truth of that comment. He could cite many instances of meat being treated with boracic and salicylic acid, and of food being prepared in filthy, unsanitary places, and he asked the House to give the Local Government Board power, not only to deal with unsound meat, but also to deal with tinned meats, instead of leaving medical officers of health as at present to do their best to cope with these evils by mere persuasion and sometimes bluff. It would be well for the House to listen to some descriptions of the way in which the food of the poor in some parts of the country was stored. In Mansfield in 1896, as a result of the preparation and storage of potted meats under uncleanly conditions, 250 persons were affected, and no doubt other isolated cases of illness were not reported. The factory inspector for the East End of London reported—

> "The sausage and brawn factories are mostly owned by Germans, who have a retail shop on the premises, and employ one or two hands to make the goods in a room behind the

> shop or in a cellar underneath. These places are small, dilapidated, badly-lit, and often infested with rats."

In the case of another provincial corporation the Report stated that beef was received in a dirty passage, and was either hung on hooks against a filthy wall or laid on the floor. It was then taken into a filthy room and cut up. The boiling pans were situated in rooms, the walls and floors of which were bespattered and dirty to such an extent that the beef must have been contaminated. The walls of these rooms were covered with soot, and altogether the place was in a condition likely to give rise to danger. Surely here the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon had an opportunity of securing protection near home. He had even worse instances in the City of London which he could quote. Not only did these Reports deal with unsound meat; they also covered the case of liquids, and he would tell them of a case showing how sarsaparilla wine—which was no doubt intended to be sold in the parks on Bank Holiday—was treated. He would read the Report of the case of an old woman charged with neglecting her four children. The sanitary inspector said that—

> "In July she found the four children locked in a back room, absolutely naked. The witness had found out for whom the woman prepared the sarsaparilla, and the work had been stopped. The Public Health Act enabled them to make the house clean, but they could not make the people clean."

He ought not to be placed in the position of having to be written to to put a stop to insanitary conditions in places where sarsaparilla wine, tinned meats, brawn, *pate de foie gras* and other things were made and sold to the poor; and he appealed to the House to give him the power to look into these matters under the regulations which he asked them to pass. It might be said that this did not apply to food imported from Canada, America, and elsewhere. He believed in equal rights between all white men in the matter of tinned foods whether they came from Canada, America, Australia, New Zealand, or Manchester or Liverpool. Whether they were sold in small towns or in the City of London, they would all have to toe the line in regard to medical and sanitary standards. It had been represented to him that the tinned foods from certain places were absolutely clean, that the places in which they were made were also absolutely clean, and that there was no danger in them at all. He must on this point read one or two extracts from Dr. Buchanan's Report, and he would leave out the names of the firms—

> "——'s Brawn: Many hog bristles and much skin and bone. Contents very dirty; ——'s Brawn: Many pig's bristles, woody fibre and dirt; ——'s Brawn; The contents of this tin were filthy. Hogs's bristles, hair, probably human, bits of wood, cotton fibres, starch granules, and dirt generally; ——'s Brawn: Filthy sample, much dirt, many hog's bristles; ——'s Brawn: Contents mainly gristle and skin with hair attached, cotton fibres, dirt and human hair. Sample unfit, in my opinion, for use; ——'s Brand, tongue: Contents very dirty."

It might be said that since the recent exposures in this country and elsewhere things had been put right, and that there was no need for any panic. He could have got this Bill last year, at the time when the food panic was at its height, but—he hoped fairly and courteously—he had declined to pass a Food Regulations Bill in a period of panic; he had determined to allow that panic period to pass over, and, a year having elapsed, he could not now be accused of taking hasty or ill-considered action. However satisfied they might be with the conditions of life, sanitary, social, municipal or political, whether in America or here, or in any country, however perfect things might be now, they could not allow them to continue with the law so defective as it was at present, because there was a strong probability that in the absence of proper regulations matters would relapse to their former condition. Well, he was not going to allow diseased horseflesh to be exported to Hamburg and transhipped to England in the shape of "Piccadilly brawn"; that kind of thing had to be stopped; he did not see why we should take from other countries what Germany, Denmark, and other European nations refused to receive. If it were necessary, he could give further instances in support of the claim he was making upon the House; he could more than justify every statement he now made, and he asked the House to give the Local Government Board power to make these regulations, which would be communicated to every sanitary authority that wanted them. Places like Salford, Liverpool, Glasgow, London, and elsewhere could not act without these regulations; therefore he asked that his Department should be entrusted with such regulations, which they would administer with fairness to all concerned. He was prepared not to enforce them for twenty-eight days after they were issued, except in a case of emergency such as the South African case, so as to give all interests affected an opportunity of examining them and communicating with the Local Government Board in the event of their thinking that they were prejudiced in any way. He would lose no opportunity during that twenty-eight days of communicating with the trades. He had already received a deputation from them, and there was no substantial opposition to giving the Local Government Board power to make these regulations. The Department would neither harass nor inconvenience those who wanted to carry on a legitimate trade in either fresh or tinned foods decently and in order; but, compatibly with doing justice to the trade, and recognising all the interests affected, he appealed to the House on behalf of the food consumer to give the Local Government Board greater power over the £40,000,000 worth of tinned food that came into the country, so that they could save the very poor, who suffered most in this respect, from the danger of death and disease which resulted from foods being stored in filthy places, or from their being made in the insanitary conditions which he had described. If the House conferred on the Local Government Board power to make these regulations that Department would, to the best of their ability, do their utmost to carry them out. None but the dishonest trader in unsound food or the dirty manufacturer who prepared the food in places where they they would not stable a horse or litter a pig, would have reason to take exception to the regulations. He therefore hoped that the House would confer on the Local Government Board the simple and effective powers for which he was now asking.

*SIR **FRANCIS POWELL** (Wigan) said he desired to support this Bill, and to offer a word of thanks to the right hon. Gentleman for his proposals. The Police and Sanitary Committee, on which he served, had been engaged time after time in discussing clauses relating to tinned meat. Great difficulty was associated with the subject, and it should not be left to chance local action. This measure should have a beneficial effect in dealing with children who were too often ill-fed, through the carelessness of their parents, who were frequently the victims also of fraud. The Bill would save children from being put into that unhappy position in which they were now liable to be given unwholesome food. The case made out by the right hon. Gentleman appeared to him to be absolutely complete, and he would feel grateful if there were not one dissentient voice raised against the measure. It was not often he could agree with His Majesty's Government, but on this occasion they had his most hearty support, and he hoped the Bill would soon become law.

*SIR **WALTER FOSTER** (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he was sure that everyone in the House desired to assist the President of the Local Government Board in trying to put a stop to the abominations which he had so graphically described by means of the extracts which he had read. He thought that no law could be too strong to put down such cases, though he was disappointed with the machinery of the Bill, which did not appear to him to be adequate to deal with this great evil. There would have to be inspection throughout the length and breadth of the land of a thorough and efficient character, and hundreds of inspectors would be required who would have to be paid out of the rates or taxes for their work. If they were to have food adequately treated and inspected, they would have to have inspectors who would attend every market and prevent diseased cattle being sold. They could do that under the present law, but unfortunately the local authorities did not assist in the work, consequently they had every day in the markets of this country diseased cattle which were sold and slaughtered in the locality and sent to London or some of the chief towns of the country to be consumed by the poor. He had brought before the House instances of cattle suffering from that terrible disease anthrax, which had been sold in the Midland counties to be consumed by the people. If that was to be stopped it must be by adequate inspection all over the country, and in order to do that they must have a sufficient staff provided. One set of inspectors would act where animals were sold in the open market, another body of inspectors would stop diseased meat in shops and factories. The right hon. Gentleman also proposed to follow the food up to the stores, and they would have to deal with cold storage places where they took in food for human consumption, and where it was kept for a certain length of time and required inspection before it was distributed. But that was a gigantic task, so gigantic that it required a large amount of consideration and a very large staff. Every part of the country would have to be equipped with a proper staff. Was the machinery proposed adequate to deal with these great evils? The publication of rules and regulations would not suffice, there must be machinery to enforce them. Food inspection to be carried out thoroughly and efficiently would necessitate hundreds of inspectors being employed and paid out of the rates. Under the existing law local authorities could have inspectors to attend markets and prevent diseased cattle from being sold and killed for food. Unfortunately local authorities would not always help in this way, and cattle suffering from diseases were constantly sold for food. The President of the Local Government Board was undertaking a gigantic task. He thought that the regulations when framed should be laid on the Table of the House for forty days. He did not think regulations of this magnitude ought to be enforced without the cognisance of the House. He therefore asked the right hon. Gentleman to agree to extend the period from twenty-eight to forty days, and he hoped that that concession would be made before they proceeded to a division.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said the right hon. Gentleman had made out a very strong case indeed for some Bill of this kind, but he thought the powers asked for were too wide. He assumed that the Bill would go upstairs.

MR. JOHN BURNS dissented.

MR. CAVE said under this Bill the powers of the Local Government Board would not be confined even to unsound and unfit food. Regulations might be made dealing with food of any kind which the President of the Local Government Board might consider injurious to health. He agreed with the suggestion that a longer period should be allowed before the regulations were put in force.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said he should not have intervened but for the indication given by the right hon. Gentleman that it was not the intention of the Government that this Bill should be sent to a Committee upstairs. If that were so it would be an entirely new departure. Nobody could doubt that there was a crying need for further regulations to stop the abominations which the right hon. Gentleman had described. That, however, was a very different thing from giving the Local Government Board as this Bill did, powers to apply not only to bad food but to any article of human consumption any regulation which might seem good to them, or which might already be in existence under the Public Health Act. That was an enormous power and was larger than was justified by anything which the right hon. Gentleman had said. It appeared to him to be one of those Bills which ought to be submitted to a Committee upstairs. Enormous, vague, indefinite powers of this kind affecting large interests and many persons ought not to be considered by the House during the small hours of the morning, and rushed through under circumstances with which they were all familiar, and which no hon. Member could contend were at all satisfactory.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) held that the powers asked for by the Local Government Board were too wide. They might, indeed, be applied to alcohol, which some people considered was injurious to health. The President of the Local Government Board would be empowered to make regulations preventing the importation of articles dangerous to the public health and by placing alcohol in that category he could prevent its importation.

MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby) supported the suggestion that the regulations should be placed upon the Table of the House. Nobody had gone the length of explaining what could be done by this Bill, and no such wide powers as were proposed ought to be given to any Department. They would not always have the right hon. Member for Battersea at the head of this Department. It was the custom in every other Department that such regulations should lie upon the Table. That was the practice under the Factory and Workshops Act, and it had been carried out from time immemorial. He did not think that in asking that this old custom should be carried out in the case of this Bill they were asking for anything unreasonable. It was very seldom indeed that such regulations were criticised, and during the last two years there had not been a single instance. The right hon. Gentleman need have no fear that any reasonable regulations would be refused. He agreed that a measure of this kind was needed. He believed that the chemicals which were being used as preservatives were in many cases deleterious, and this was the only civilised country in the world which had not imposed regulations in regard to the use of preservatives. He held that this was a matter in which the health of the people should be protected.

*MR. JOHN BURNS said he was quite willing to concede the request of the right hon. Member for the Ilkeston Division that the regulations should not come into operation for a period of forty days, and that they should be laid before Parliament. He hoped the proposal that the Bill should be sent to a Standing Committee would be withdrawn. This was a Bill of one clause, and there was no reason why it should not be considered by Committee of the Whole House.

DR. COOPER asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Balcarres.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. John Burns.*)

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA BILL.

Order for the Lords' Amendments to be considered, read.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked an explanation of the changes made by the Amendments.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.) said the first, which was inserted at the desire of the Federal Government, was introduced in order to embody in the schedule the Address of the Colonial Premiers which led up to this Bill. As to the other Amendment, the Bill provided for the payment of grants to certain provinces of Canada according as their population increased. Prince Edward's Island was the only province with a decreasing population, but it was protected by an Order in Council against losing any grant through a decrease of population. Under this Amendment that province would retain that position, while benefiting from any increase of population.

Lords' Amendments agreed to.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (TONNAGE DEDUCTION FOR PROPELLING POWER) BILL.

Bill, as amended, considered.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said he promised when the Bill was in Committee to make it perfectly clear that it would not interfere with the existing rights of certain docks and harbours. In order to carry out that promise he would move a new clause.

*MR. SPEAKER: You cannot do that without notice.

*MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Very well, I shall see that the clause is inserted in another place.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be now read a third time."—(*Mr. Lloyd George*).

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

PRISONS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Redmond Barry*).

LORD R. CECIL said the Second Reading had been moved without a word of explanation, although the House did not know anything about the Bill. He thought the Government was becoming very cavalier in its treatment of the House.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. REDMOND BARRY, Tyrone, N.) said the object of the Bill was to apply to Irish prisons a single section of the English Prisons Act giving certain powers as to the revision of sentences according to rules prescribed by the Prisons Board.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) (APPLICATION OF PENALTIES) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire), in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said it contained one clause and was of a Departmental character agreed upon between the two Departments concerned. It proposed that the penalties now recovered for offences against the police regulations as to trawling, which had hitherto gone into the Treasury, should now go into the Marine Fund under the control of the Scottish Fishery Board. The Bill had the support of both sides of the House.

Motion made, and Question "That the Bill be now read a second time,'"—(*Mr. Sinclair*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. SINCLAIR, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said it was of a non-controversial character. About three years ago a whale fishery was established in the North and West of Scotland, and consequent upon the establishment of that fishery there was an inquiry into its effects. It happened that about that period there had been one or two rather bad seasons in these particular districts in connection with the herring fisheries, and some alarm was aroused lest there should be a direct connection between the establishment of the whale fishery and the depression in the herring fisheries. The Fisheries Board appointed a Commission to inquire, and a Bill based on the Report of the Commission was introduced to regulate the whale fishing industry. The Bill did not pass, and that was partly because the movement in support of the measure had greatly diminished owing to the return of prosperity in the herring fisheries. For a year or two there had been no great evidence of a desire that the Bill should pass. Last year, however, the herring fisheries again failed in those particular districts where the whale fishing industry was carried on, and, responding to a request, the Government undertook to consider whether it would not be well to introduce legislation founded upon the Commission's Report of 1904. This Bill was the redemption of that pledge. The Bill was drawn on lines similar to previous Bills. There was a strong feeling in many parts of Scotland that the question should be dealt with on the lines of the present Bill, and he believed it was possible that it might be passed this session, with the general consent of both sides of the House. It did not prohibit the whale fishing industry, but sought to place it under regulations of licence. There were some critics who desired that the Government should prohibit the industry altogether. The Government did not take that view, and this step towards regulation and licence, he believed, would have the general assent of both Parties. The herring fishing industry in Scotland was so important that it behoved them to do what they could to protect its interests. Several points would no doubt arise in Committee, but they were capable of adjustment. He hoped the House would assist in passing the measure this session.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Lord R. CECIL said that this was a Bill of very considerable length and its details were highly complicated. He had listened carefully to the speech of the Secretary for Scotland, but he could not understand what was the object of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the herring fishing had failed, but he understood that it was because it had something to do with the whale-catching industry. What bearing the whale-catching industry had upon the herring fishing industry he did not know. He did not pretend to be a fisherman himself. He would have thought that if the whales were bad for the herring, then the more whales caught the better. If the whales were good for the herring, then he did not see how regulations and licence were likely to attract the whales. He could see, however, that the Bill was a severe one. It proposed to subject an industry at present carried on free to a very heavy licensing duty. A licence for a steamer for example, would cost £100, and any one who contravened the provisions of the Bill would be liable to penalties amounting in some cases to as much as £500. There was a mysterious clause, entitled "saving for certain whales." He did not know what whales it was supposed to save—although in the clause bottle-nose and caaing whales were mentioned. He desired some explanation why these whales should be slaughtered indiscriminately, when for the killing of sperm and other whales a licence was required.

Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): Marylebone whales.

Lord R. CECIL: The hon. Gentleman clearly knows all about it. I do not see why these "bone" whales should be killed ruthlessly.

Mr. GULLAND: Merely bone whales.

Lord R. CECIL: Oh, it is a joke. I beg pardon.

Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's): It is a Scottish joke.

Lord R. CECIL: It is very creditable at any rate, I assure you. He desired to know what particular advantage was to be got out of the Bill; and he hoped the Secretary for Scotland would explain what he really wanted by the Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR said there were many different kinds of whales. The bottle-nose and caaing whales were not injurious to the herring, and there was, therefore, a saving for those whales under the Bill. Under the Bill were several other kinds of whales, which were the subject of pursuit by whale fishers, such as blue whales, "finners," and sperm whales. With regard to the licences the establishments were to be licensed according to the number of steamers used in the fishing. A factory on shore was proportionate to the number of steamers employed. The injury attributed to the whaling industry was two-fold. In the first place, it was an injury to the locality in the sense that sanitary precautions were necessary to prevent offensive smells and the pollution of sea water near the factories. In certain establishments such sanitary precautions were already taken. Every portion of the whale was used, and when the factories were properly administered there was no nuisance, or it was reduced to a minimum, and certainly the local authorities would consider these facts. He had visited one of these establishments last year, and he found it one of the best in the whole district. He was sorry that an hon. Member who sat opposite was not present because that establishment was on his property. The other injury was the danger to the herring fishing by the towing of carcases from where they were killed to the factories on shore. Scientifically that was a matter of dispute. It was certainly not proved that the presence of whales or the existence of a whale-fishing industry under proper regulations was necessarily injurious to the herring fishing.

Lord R. CECIL: What is supposed to be the injury that the whales do to the herring, and how are you to stop it by licensing?

Mr. SINCLAIR said it was alleged by practical men that herrings had disappeared where whale fishing was carried on. Scientifically that was a matter in dispute. It was alleged that the Norwegian authorities prohibited in certain districts of that country the whale fishery because it did damage to the herring fishery; but he had ascertained that that was not the case. However, there was ground for alarm at the present time, and if they did not restrict the growth of the whaling industry it might attain dimensions which would double whatever evil existed. While they had no desire to destroy an industry in which British as well as foreign capital was employed, no steps should be omitted which could allay the existing alarm in the herring fishing industry while not damaging any other interest. As to the amount of the licence, no doubt they could come to agreement in Committee on that point, as well as to the number of steamers to be allowed to each of the factories. A case had been made out for the regulation of the industry. It was not intended to act in the least harshly towards the whaling industry which had grown up. They certainly ought carefully to watch the growth of the industry. They were placing it under the administration of the Fishery Board in Scotland, and it would be for them to keep their eye upon it and to watch its development. He would ask the House to allow the Bill to be read a second time. There was a consensus of opinion among Scottish Members and those interested in fishing constituencies that it was exceedingly desirable both on the merits of the case and in view of the public opinion which existed on the question that the House should allow the Bill to pass, and, as he had said, there were points which could be adjusted in Committee.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) said that representing as he did some thousands of fishermen on the coast of Fife he hoped he would be allowed to say a word or two in favour of the Bill. He did not think there was a single fisherman among his constituents who would not welcome the Bill with all his heart. It provided a close time for whales and prevented the murder of them when they were accompanied by their young. The fishermen liked the live whale and hated the dead whale. The dead whale fouled the water and drove the herring away. The live whale drove the herrings into shoals, and they thought they drove them towards the shore. Naturally they could catch the fish better near the shore than if they had to go hundreds of miles after them, as they now often had to do. He was sure there was nothing in the Bill that anybody could reasonably object to. Personally, he wished it had gone further and had abolished the whole of the whale-fishery in the interests of the fishermen of his constituency. So far as it went, he thought it was a reasonable Bill and one which would be heartily welcomed by all fishermen on the coast of Scotland.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said he desired to express his thanks to the right hon. Gentleman for having introduced the Bill and also his sincere hope that when they got into Committee he would carry it a great deal further than it went at the present time. It was practically impossible for him at this period of the session to represent the feeling of his constituents upon the measure. For five or six years the use of herring boats had been gradually diminishing till where formerly there were hundreds there were now practically none. He sincerely hoped the Bill would go through, and that his right hon. friend would take power, should he find it necessary in the interests of the herring trade, to apply the drastic remedy of stopping the whale fishing altogether. It was not an industry at all. It was simply an operation of killing animals of whose habits of life we were absolutely ignorant. When they got them, they were comparatively useless, and it was a wicked and wrong thing to upset the herring fishing industry without reason. No one could imagine what a serious matter it was to the people living in Orkney and Shetland, and unless something was done in the north of Scotland to put the whaling stations under proper control and regulations, and unless the Secretary for Scotland took power to stop them, if necessary, they would have a similar state of things there to that which existed in Norway.

LORD BALCARRES said he supported the Second Reading of the Bill, though he thought the hon. Member who had just spoken and who put down all the evils attendant upon the herring fishing industry to the whale fishery was rather too sanguine as to its result. Competition in the whale fishery had increased lately and had driven the fleet further and further to sea, and, when the right hon. Gentleman talked about the whales having been caught within a few miles of land he was in error. The whales were captured at great distance from the shore. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland was going to allow the Bill to stay in the House. The whales were not caught in Scottish waters, and the Bill therefore was not one which should be sent to the Scottish Grand Committee.

MR. SINCLAIR: We do not propose to send it to that Committee.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he had had a great many complaints on account of the nuisance caused by the killing of the whales, and, although it was late in the session he hoped the House would allow the Bill to be passed so that the whale fishing might be regulated and an end put to the nuisance which was dangerous to the public health and interfered with the trade of the fishermen.

MR. BOWLES said he would not have intervened in the debate had he not been informed of a fact of which he was not previously aware, that a relative of his took an active part in destroying this Bill on some former occasion. He was bound to say it seemed to him that the hon. Member had very good ground for the action he took on that occasion, and for his part he should, if they went to a division, be forced to vote against the measure. His constituents had not the slightest interest in the whale fishery. The House therefore would realise that he was at any rate impartial, and, having listened to the debate, he did not even now understand the grounds upon which the Bill was put forward. It was clear they had a considerable and growing industry in the whale fishery all round the coast of Scotland. Factories had been set up and a considerable amount of capital and labour was engaged. It was now proposed for the first time that a great and growing industry should be put in leading strings and under restriction. He respectfully submitted to a free trade House that *prima facie* that was a serious matter. It required great justification to restrict in any way by Government action an industry which was spontaneously growing up. The Secretary for Scotland had said there were two sorts of whales, one harmful and one harmless. He had further said that there were two kinds of whales harmless to the herring. But what was he doing? He was allowing these two kinds of whales quite harmless to the herring fishery to be killed with perfect freedom. He did not know whether the carcases of those whales would not be prejudicial to the herring fishery, but, whatever the effect might be in that regard, the fact remained that those harmless animals were to be destroyed by anybody, while with regard to the other kinds of whales which were harmful and which destroyed the herring fisheries their slaughter was to be restricted, because they were only to be destroyed by persons licensed to slaughter them. He objected entirely to putting any industry of this kind into leading strings unless good cause could be shown, and in this case he did not think good cause had been shown. The right hon. Gentleman had clearly demonstrated by his remarks that his proposal, if carried into effect, would be of no use, and that a good deal more harm than good would be done.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [LORDS].

Order for Second Reading read.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland), in moving the Second Reading, said the title of the Bill was very wide, its scope exceedingly narrow. He explained that it was necessary in order to enable ratification to be given to the Convention with foreign Powers for the prohibition of the industrial employment of women at night which had been entered into last year by all the countries of Western and Central Europe, with the exception of Norway. Our law went in most respects beyond the requirements of the Convention which had been signed by our representatives except in two small particulars. In certain flax scutch mills the hours of employment of women were by the Factory Act left entirely unregulated, and there was a provision in the Coal Mines Regulation Act enabling women to be employed on surface work at mines on Friday evenings at hours later than would be authorised by the Convention. These two provisions of our industrial law were entirely obsolete. They must be repealed to enable ratification to be given to the Convention.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) said there could be no objection to the passing of this measure, which proposed only to repeal a clause of the Factory and Workshops Act, 1901, and a clause of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, in order, as the hon. Gentleman had said, to enable this country to ratify a Convention that had been made with foreign Powers. All he desired was to ask whether an article had been inserted in that Convention to compel the Governments of other countries to enforce control in this matter. That question had an effect so far as this Bill was concerned, because one would naturally suppose that if this country carried out to the letter these proposals, other Governments would do the same, and that our workpeople would not be put into a different position from that of the workpeople abroad. He also wished to know when the Convention came into force, because he did not understand clearly what was the effect of Article 7 of the Convention. That Article proposed that the Convention was to come into force two years after the date of ratification, but allowed, apparently, a time limit of ten years in respect to certain raw sugar and woolcombing operations. He wished to know when the Convention would come into force and whether the employment of women at night was to be forbidden in other countries as in this.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said with regard to the first question of the right hon. Gentleman he might say that the signatory Powers bound themselves by proper administrative measures to enforce the requirements of the Convention. The Convention came into force two years after the deposit of ratifications. That deposit must be made before the end of next year. A delay of ten years was allowed for certain exceptional cases, of which the most important was the wool combing and weaving industry. This delay had to be conceded in order to secure the signature of Belgium to the Convention.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

SALMON AND FRESHWATER FISHERIES BILL [LORDS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

*MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.) said he desired to move an Amendment after line 14. This Bill did not deal with the general law of salmon fisheries, but it enabled Provisional Orders to be made under conditions relating to salmon fishery districts. Clause 4 dealt with the machinery. Preliminary to the Provisional Order being made an inquiry had to be held, after which a draft Order was sent down to the district to which it related. This clause provided that the Board of Agriculture might hold an inquiry in regard to the proposed Order, and all that his Amendment provided was that it should not be a matter of discretion, but that a second inquiry should be held if the county council so directed.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 14, after the word 'expedient,' to insert the words 'and shall if any county council having authority within the area of the proposed order directs."—(*Mr. Lloyd Morgan*).

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 37, after the words 'Conservators,' to insert the words 'or county councils.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

LORD R. CECIL said that the Bill came down from the House of Lords, and it had these words put in in brackets and underlined. He wished to know whether this was one of the devices by which the House of Lords avoided committing a breach of the privileges of the House of Commons, and, if so, on whose advice they acted.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.) said that these words were merely put in because they came down from another place. There was no object in it whatever. It was merely a formal matter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 6, to insert the words '(b) and in the case of county councils out of the county funds.'"—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BOWLES said it appeared to him that this might impose a new charge on a great number of county councils, and the House ought to have some explanation or description of the kind of expense that was to be incurred. He did not know whether the hon. Gentleman had considered that in certain cases the expense might be very high.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said he entirely sympathised with the desire of the hon. Gentleman to have some information on this point. No great charge would be thrown on the county councils under this Bill. But if a county council thought it right to promote a Bill one of the objects of this Bill would be to assist the county council.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Seven o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 5th August, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliament had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders in respect of the Amendments made in Committee of this House to the following Bill have not been complied with—

Armagh Urban District Council. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Armagh Urban District Council Bill. Examiner's Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next.

Swansea Harbour Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Aberdeen Corporation Electricity Bill [H.L.], Midland Railway Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill; Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered (according to order), and agreed to.

Brought from the Commons.

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill. Read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^a (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 151.)

Dumbarton Burgh and County Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Dumbarton Burgh and County Tramways—Was presented by the Lord Granard (E. Granard) for the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7) deemed to have been read 2^a, and reported from the Committee. (No. 152.)

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 532. Surveys of British Africa (Annual Report of the Colonial Survey Committee, second year, to July, 1907).

No. 533. Wei-hai-Wei (Report for 1906).

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Memorandum on the teaching of drawing.

TUBERCULOSIS (HUMAN AND BOVINE) (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Appendix, Part II. (2 vols.), to the second interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the relations of human and animal tuberculosis.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 30th June, 1907.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

Return of tenants (or their representatives) who had been evicted from three "Plan of Campaign" estates purchased or proposed to be purchased by the Estates Commissioners, and who have been reinstated in their former holdings or provided with other holdings.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Annual Report of the Registrar General, for the year 1906.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1906–1907.

Presented (by Command) and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

Rules of the Supreme Court. (August, 1907.)

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF STAFFORD).

Order made by the council of the county of Stafford, altering the Handsworth Sandwell (South) Polling District of the Handsworth Parliamentary Division of Staffordshire.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST, NEW ZEALAND)

The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 9) Warrant, 1907, dated 19th July, 1907.

LAND REGISTRY.

Account of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Moved, That the Lord Balfour be appointed to take the Chair in the Committee of the Whole House this day in the absence of the Chairman of Committees (The Lord Privy Seal (*M. Ripon*), ; agreed to.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn) : My Lords, I do not think it will be necessary to trouble your Lordships with a long speech on this occasion, because this measure, which has come up from the House of Commons, corresponds in its main features with the Bill which received the approbation of this House and was passed through all its stages last year. As I then explained, the object of the Government in introducing the Bill was that there should be an opportunity for appeal in regard to all convictions upon indictment, in order that those who had been struck by the criminal law should be placed in a position, with respect to appeal, similar to that enjoyed by litigants in civil causes.

There was a good deal of feeling against the Bill at that time, but I venture to think that the lapse of time has greatly diminished whatever hostility there was to its principle, because, singularly enough, events have occurred within the last twelve months, which, at least to my mind, raise the question whether there should be an appeal to the Press or an appeal to His Majesty's Judges, and for my part I have no hesitation in expressing a preference for His Majesty's Judges. That is the opinion, I think I may fairly say, of your Lordships also, because the principle of the Bill last year was not really contested, and in some parts the Bill met with the approbation of the greatest living authority on the subject, the noble and learned Earl who preceded me on the Woolsack, although in some matters I agree he was not able to concur. The Bill now comes before your Lordships, with something very near unanimity as to the general principle, from the House of Commons. I shall therefore at this stage confine myself to a very short indication of the points in which the Bill now presented to your Lordships differs from the Bill that was agreed to last year.

First, as to the constitution of the Court. Last year all His Majesty's Judges were to be members of the Court of Criminal Appeal. This Bill provides that only nine of the Judges are to be members of the Court, with the Lord Chief Justice as President. The second point is as to the subject-matter of appeal. Last year all matters of fact and of law and of mixed fact and law were referable to the Court of Appeal by leave either of the Judge or of the Court of Appeal. In this Bill all these matters are still subject to appeal, but there is the additional provision that without leave an appeal is given in all cases of capital sentence. The third point is as to the remedy or relief which can be given by the Court. Under the Bill of last year as originally introduced the Court of Appeal might either confirm the conviction, or quash the conviction, but they were not entitled to order a new trial. That was my own original view, and I thought it was the best view or I should not have inserted it in the Bill. But during the progress of the Bill through your Lordships' House high legal authorities expressed the opinion that the Court of Appeal ought also to be given the power to order a new trial, and

I yielded to that opinion, although it did not correspond entirely with my judgment. That provision for a new trial was contained in the Bill as it was introduced in the House of Commons; but the provision was struck out by the Commons. Mr. Akers-Douglas, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, and others of experience and knowledge took an extremely strong view on this point, and I think there is a great deal to be said for the action of the Commons, because it approaches the confines of torture to put a man on trial twice for the same offence. Those are the only differences of substance—at least they are the principal differences—between the Bill as it left your Lordships' House last year and the Bill as it stands now, and I beg respectfully to commend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, as it is not my intention to move the rejection of this Bill it will not be necessary to go very minutely into the objections which I have to it. On the other hand, I think it would be uncandid, and perhaps not quite fair to my noble and learned friend, if I did not point out what was the substance of my objection to the Bill before we get into Committee. I protest, in the first place, against the proposition of the noble and learned Lord that this Bill is in a great measure necessary because events have occurred which raise the alternative of trial by Judges or trial by newspapers. That seems to me to indicate a weakness somewhere, to which I, for one, will not assent. I cannot understand why the legislation of the country in the most serious matter of the administration of the criminal law should be affected one way or the other because irresponsible persons think it proper to assume that they have knowledge superior to that of His Majesty's Judges.

I must say I a little dissent from one observation made by the Lord Chancellor —namely, that feeling has greatly changed in favour of this Bill. I cannot assent to that. I agree that dissatisfaction with the decisions of the Home Office has increased; and I do not wonder at it, when it is found that the only mitigating circumstance in a case of murder is that the murderer thought his victim was his father and shot him. It is said that a new trial can be had in all civil cases. Stated broadly like that, that is not true. It is one of those delusions which pass from hand to hand and nobody has yet apparently corrected the error into which fall people who are not familiar with the administration of the law in our Courts. But it is not true to say there is a right of new trial in civil cases. Upon the question of fact there is no right of new trial, and I deny altogether that you are now making the law as applicable to criminal cases the same as in civil cases. You are doing nothing of the sort. You are giving an absolute power to set aside a conviction on a question of fact. I object to that for two or three reasons. I regard it as a most serious constitutional alteration of our whole system.

A man has the right to be tried by a jury; and to say that the question may be remitted to a Committee of Judges is to make a serious innovation in our whole legal system. I hope none of His Majesty's Judges will be angry with me if I say, after a somewhat extended experience, that in my view the judgment of a jury is better on a question of fact than that of the learned Judges, who are at times a little disposed to be too technical. At all events, the Constitution has made the tribunal on fact the jury, and for myself I very much regret to see an attack made on that institution. Further than that, the consideration of this subject has been made the opportunity of using expressions about the Judges with which I am sure the Lord Chancellor has no sympathy. Yet this question has arisen apparently, out of cases which were not decided by his Majesty's Judges at all; one case, the Beck case, for instance, was decided by a Recorder, and the Edalji case by the chairman of a court of quarter sessions. Any one would think from the cry that has been got up that no complaints had ever been made before our time against convictions. I remember Barber's case very well. That case was decided before one of the ablest Judges that ever sat on the English Bench, but I do not think that in connection with that case we ever had such observations made against the Judges as I was pained to see were made elsewhere.

I repeat that in my opinion the proposed change will greatly diminish the sense of responsibility in the jury. To my mind, nothing could be more mischievous than to give an unqualified right of appeal in every case of capital conviction. Last year there were twenty-eight capital convictions, and if this right were exercised, as we may assume it would be, there would thus be added to the list of cases twenty-eight which would have to be examined with that minute care which characterises an English trial for murder. I think that many people who speak and write on the subject have never witnessed an English trial for murder, for if any one wants an example of the minute and careful administration of justice it can be found there.

Then, too, if you take nine Judges from their ordinary avocations for this purpose, how are the arrears of work to be diminished, on account of which you are at this moment appointing a new Judge? Then you will have a great many more appeals subject to certain conditions. There were 12,000 people convicted last year, and what proportion of them would appeal I cannot say. It may be said that when loss of liberty and of life are at stake you ought to incur the risk of having a great many arrears; but I believe it is absolutely untrue to say that injustice is done in the administration of the law in this country. Moreover, by establishing this Court of Appeal, are you going to get rid of trial by newspaper? Will those who have commented on a public trial before a jury be silenced if they think there is reason to complain, because the case will be tried by a Committee of Judges?

To my mind, the worst feature of the whole system proposed is that witnesses are not to be heard. It is not, then, to be a new trial, for the life and body of the evidence, as more than one learned Judge has described it, will be lacking. The Committee of Judges are not to have the witnesses before them but they are to have the shorthand writer's notes; but the shorthand writer's notes will not tell the Judges how the witnesses looked, how they spoke, whether they hesitated, or how they stood the test of cross-examination. All they will have will be the record, faithfully taken down, I admit, of the evidence; and I must say I entirely approve of a shorthand note being taken of every criminal trial. I do not say that it should necessarily be transcribed, but the note should be taken so that it could be transcribed if required.

These are but a few of the objections which I entertain to this new departure, but, for the reasons I have given, I do not think it necessary to say more at present. I deeply lament what I think is a reversal of our whole system. It is curious that while we are talking about altering our system and so bringing it into consonance with the practice prevailing in the United States, the United States are considering whether they ought not to alter their system and bring it back into consonance with ours, because of the gross abuses involved in this practice of appeal in criminal cases. It is not my intention to move the rejection of the Bill, but I shall endeavour, in Committee, to get rid of some of the evils attendant on its being passed, and I shall hope to carry the majority of your Lordships with me.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I feel that this is an extremely important and delicate subject and one to be approached with the greatest consideration and care. It is impossible to overstate the importance of the proposal to found a Court of Criminal Appeal. The mere use of those words contains an immense statement of what may be an obvious and great piece of justice. I know of no civilised country that does not recognise the desirability of having some power of review and examination in criminal cases.

There is nothing new in this proposal. Some of the greatest legal reformers in this country have for the last half-century applied their minds to this question, not always from the same point of view, not always dealing with the same provisions, not always suggesting the same method or giving the same measure of relief, but all recognising that there should be a right of appeal in criminal cases where there was a possibility that a re-examination might prevent an injustice being done. The whole history of our law shows a steady and sometimes a rapid development towards reform in our criminal procedure. If one contrasts the present administration of our criminal law with what took place in the reign of George III. and long after, when people were hanged for the most trivial offences, one will see the vast development that has taken place. This idea of reform in criminal procedure has grown with our growth and strengthened with our strength. Trials are carried on with every desire to act fairly and to give consideration to every topic of defence that can be urged, and by a recent reform prisoners are now enabled to give their own story and their own point of view. The death sentence is now limited—and rightly limited—to cases not only of murder, but of deliberate murder.

But now a point has been reached. This, as I have said, is not a new Bill. It follows some forty or fifty previous Bills, all seeking to accomplish the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal. Therefore I think the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack is justified in applying his mind as seriously and as earnestly as he has done to seeing whether the time has not been reached when a determined and resolute effort should be made to place such a measure upon the Statute Book. It is not possible in human affairs to get all minds to concur, but there is agreement as to a substantial part of this question of criminal law reform; there is agreement as to the fairness, the justice, and the obvious necessity of giving an appeal to a proper Court in the simplest way on points of law. That is not in controversy. Where differences of opinion and objections arise is as to the giving of an appeal upon questions of fact and upon sentences. The present system is unsatisfactory. It has worked for a great number of years, and I daresay it has often worked very well, but it has sometimes worked in a way that was not satisfactory. The system of the Home Office reviewing cases on petition of the prisoners has one advantage—the Home Secretary and his advisers are not bound by strict rules of law and precedure, and they can take an elastic, untechnical, commonsense view of the case. But, as I say, that system is not always satisfactory. Many thousands of petitions are presented to the Home Secretary every year. The Home Office has to apply itself to this enormously difficult task without any open assistance. It cannot have a hearing in public; it cannot invoke, as far as I know, the aid of an independent Judge who has not theretofore applied himself to the case. The Home Secretary has to deal as best he can with the particulars before him. It is a difficult branch of administration thus entrusted to an official, no matter how highly placed or anxious to do what is just. But, over and above that, I see it stated that Judges themselves are found not infrequently, after a trial, to invoke an investigation by the Home Office. That all goes to show that the larger provision comprised in this Bill is urgently needed. My noble and learned friend who has just spoken, and for whose opinion I have the greatest respect, as I am sure is the case with every Member of your Lordships' House, has put aside, I think too authoritatively, the effect of the interference of the Press and public discussion in reference to the administration of this jurisdiction. It is always a difficulty in the way of the Home Secretary to have discussions going on in the Press and efforts made to form and develop what is called public opinion, not for his assistance, but in order to lead him to a particular conclusion. I cannot see that this can be regarded as satisfactory, but if this Bill is not passed, what is the alternative? It strikes one with surprise that while in civil cases a man may appeal even to your Lordships' House, a man who has been sentenced to penal servitude, and has a strong objection, if not on a point of law, at all events on a question of fact, has no power to make an objection, except by a private petition to the Home Office. Surely that is a condition of things that can hardly be regarded as satisfactory. I do not know any other country possessing a system of legal jurisprudence that shuts out the element of appeal in criminal cases. The noble and learned Earl beside me referred to America. I am not going to defend the American system, but if I were a criminal, or at all events a person charged with crime, I think I should like to emigrate to America rather than stay here. But that is not the question. It is reasonable that there should be some Court which could be asked to say whether there was anything in the case which called for review, subject to the safeguards provided in the Bill. I admit that there is a danger that this change may tend to weaken the responsibility of the jury, but that consideration is not sufficient to prevent my looking at the purposes of the Bill and considering whether it cannot be made a useful and valuable measure. There is also the danger that the Court will be congested with a great number of appeals. But I hope the Judges will use their discretionary powers with a firm hand. Moreover, there is no appeal on fact except by leave of the Court, and sentences may be increased as well as reduced. These are checks which were not contained in the Bill of last year. The Bill is a great experiment, and no doubt the teachings of experience will show that some amendment will be desirable, and will enable us to obtain from it a more useful and certain assistance in the administration of justice.

LORD COLERIDGE: My Lords, I hope this Bill will pass its Second Reading and eventually become law without any very substantial amendment. That there should be an appeal on all questions which are not of a criminal nature, and yet no appeal in cases in which life and liberty are at stake, must strike all persons as an anomaly which cannot be allowed permanently to exist; and if this Bill passes into law I venture to prophesy that those who come after us will wonder that we remained so long without remedying so substantial an injustice. Many efforts have been made to remedy this state of things. Your Lordships will recollect that years ago a very learned Commission was appointed to codify the criminal law and that that Commission reported in favour of an appeal on questions of law; but the rock upon which most of those recommendations have split has been the fact that the recommendations have taken the line of advising that in questions of appeal the Court of Appeal should be able to grant a new trial. There are obvious objections to this course—objections on the score of delay, on the score of being unable to get together the witnesses, on the score of expense, and, more potent than all, there is the objection that if the Court of Appeal grants a new trial on the ground of misstatement of fact that is equivalent in law and in logic to their stating that the man ought never to have been convicted, and if he ought never to have been convicted then by our law he is entitled to acquittal. Therefore there was a certain illogicality running throughout the recommendations in suggesting that the Court of Appeal should, in one breath, say that a man ought not to have been convicted upon the evidence, and give the go-by to the old maxim that the prosecution must prove the case beyond reasonable doubt or otherwise the prisoner is entitled to his acquittal. This difficulty is removed by the present Bill, and I presume the really disputable point in the Bill is the question of appeal on matters of fact. To my mind that is the most important and the most valuable part of the Bill. The public is not interested in the unravelling of knotty points of law; what the public is interested in is to see that substantially no injustice is done so far as human foresight can prevent it.

No one can doubt that mistakes have been made and will be made. Mistakes may arise out of questions of identity, they may arise out of a defence of alibi, or they may arise out of placing too much trust or reliance on the evidence of experts in handwriting. There are other grounds on which mistakes have been made and will be made, and when made they have led to injustice. It may be said that such mistakes can be corrected by the Home Office and its officials. No doubt that is so, but that is a tribunal sitting in secret which does not give its reasons; and, though I do not doubt for a moment that they deserve every confidence in the manner and the result of their investigations, yet you cannot expect people outside to have the same confidence in a secret tribunal of this kind that they would have in a public tribunal. For these reasons I trust that the Bill will pass into law without any essential change.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I hope the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack will not be shocked at my temerity in rising to say two or three words before he replies. The noble and learned Lord who has just addressed us said a moment ago that only lawyers were interested in these knotty points of legal procedure. I am not quite sure that I entirely admit that. I am quite prepared to admit that only lawyers may be competent to discuss them thoroughly in all their technical bearings. But the public is interested, I think, and very much interested in the question that we are discussing this evening. We, the lay Members of your Lordships' House, are always at considerable disadvantage in debates of this kind, and we are usually glad and ready to be guided by those who do possess the requisite amount of expert knowledge and to the best of my recollection we are generally fortunate in finding that the eminent lawyers who sit in this House are able to give us, without distinction of Party, advice which the House is able to follow as a whole.

But upon this occasion I own I have listened to the discussion with feelings of some misgiving. It appears to me that we are all of us agreed up to a certain point, and up to a certain point only. We all desire to see some change in the present law. We are all dissatisfied with what the noble and learned Lord described as trial by newspaper. We are all ready to see an appeal given in criminal cases on points of law; but beyond that point there does not seem to me to be any unanimity. My noble and learned friend beside me, Lord Halsbury, is certainly unable to agree with the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and so far as I was able to follow my noble friend, Lord Ashbourne, he does not seem entirely to agree with either of those two great authorities. Then we all remember the speech which the Lord Chief Justice delivered last year, and we have no reason for believing that the noble and learned Lord has changed his mind.

Speaking as an ignorant layman, there are one or two points in the Government Bill which I regard with a considerable amount of apprehension. There is, I think, in the minds of many of us an uneasy feeling that if the Bill is likely to do good in certain cases by preventing a miscarriage of justice in such cases, at other points it may lead to a very inconvenient disturbance of our judicial system. It seems to me to follow obviously that if this Bill becomes law there will be a great increase in the number of criminal appeals. In capital cases the right of appeal will be exercised without the deterrent effect of a possible increase of the sentence, and is it not almost inevitable that our already overburdened tribunals will have thrown upon them a great additional burden by the number of these appeals. Is it not also obvious that a great expense will be occasioned by the number of additional trials which will take place and, I presume, the number of additional Judges who will be required to try them?

There is another point which seems to me to be intelligible even to the understanding of the humblest layman, and it is this, that the passage of this Bill cannot fail greatly to diminish the feeling of responsibility which now attaches to our jurymen, and that it will be likely to lead them to be less careful than they are now in the performance of their difficult and responsible duties. Again, if these cases are to be heard on appeal, the second trial, in the absence of the witnesses, is likely to be less conclusive and satisfactory than the original trial. These are all points which seem to me to be comparatively simple and easily intelligible, and I confess that they are points which fill me with a certain amount of apprehension in regard to this Bill. Before sitting down I venture to make, with great deference, a suggestion. Upon former occasions when those differences of opinion have arisen there have been informal exchanges of opinion outside the House by its great legal authorities. I cannot help hoping that between the Second Reading debate and the Committee stage it may be found possible, as it was found possible last year, to find some means of reconciling the divergent views which have been expressed this evening, and of submitting the Bill to the House in a shape which may make it acceptable to all of us without the apprehensions which some of us now feel.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, though this debate has been short, the subject-matter of it is of very real importance. I have never attempted to attenuate the importance of the subject, knowing as I do that the giving of an appeal of this kind is in substance a novel proceeding in the criminal law of this country. It is not, however, a proceeding which has been thrust unexpectantly or without long preliminary deliberation upon Parliament. It has been the subject of deliberation by many very distinguished men, and I hope we shall now come to a satisfactory conclusion upon it.

I can only say that I have always been willing, and always will be, to attempt to come to an agreement on any measure in which I have been interested, but I must say that some of the differences are more than skin deep. However, I need hardly say that I will respond to the expression of hope which the noble Marquess has uttered. Everybody agrees that on questions of law there should be an appeal, but questions of law are very rare in criminal cases. It is nearly always a question of fact, either as the sole element or as the main ingredient in it. The reason for wishing to have an appeal on the question of fact is derived, in the first place, from the antecedent probability that human nature will make mistakes, or is liable to make mistakes, and that there ought to be some means of obtaining a skilled review in appropriate cases. It is a terrible thing for a man to be convicted. It ruins his future; his character is gone, and it causes infinite pain and anguish and misery to all who belong to him.

But apart from the antecedent probability of error there is the acknowledged fact that error exists. We are constantly investigating in this House and in the Court of Appeal cases in which juries have gone wrong on questions of fact; and we are often unable to agree with the views of Judges on points of law and on directions of law upon the question of fact and their treatment of questions of fact. If men are liable to go wrong in their judgments in civil causes, why are they not under similiar liability in criminal cases? In a civil cause any one can appeal down to £50; but that a man should have no right of appeal against a conviction which may involve penal servitude and a career and character blasted for life is most extraordinary, and in this position this country is unique among nations. I do not believe there is any country that has not some form of appeal.

When I spoke of trial by newspaper, I meant that, when a case arose in which facts were disputed, newspapers brought the matter forward, partially and inadequately, and what agitated the public mind was that there was no impartial tribunal to settle the dispute. I put aside the question of the necessity of appointing more Judges; we are not so impoverished that we cannot afford £15,000 or £20,000 for such a reform.

As to the impairing of the sense of responsibility among jurymen, I do not think the knowledge that there is an appeal will influence their consideration for a moment or affect their judgment. If such knowledge would have such effect, then it is the most complete condemnation of the jury system applied to civil causes. In answer to what the noble Marquess said, may I offer him in the first place an exhortation, and in the second place a respectful admonition. The exhortation is that he will take part in legal discussions. The law is nothing but educated commonsense as a rule, and as he possesses commonsense, although he has not had a special legal education, I can assure him that his contributions will be most grateful. The admonition is that difference is the breath of our nostrils, and that there is no likelihood of unanimity among members of the legal profession. In reply to the remarks of the noble and learned Earl, it is to be observed that among lawyers there are at the commencement always differences of opinion upon, and objection to, any reform of the law; but I will venture to prophesy that in two or three years this reform will receive a chorus of approval from the profession, and gratitude will be accorded your Lordships' House for having passed it into law.

On Question, Motion agreed to. Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

House in Committee (according to Order.)

[Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH in the Chair].

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

The LORD CHANCELLOR: This clause refers to settlements of a married woman's separate property, and it provides that—

> "a settlement or agreement for a settlement made after the commencement of this Act by the husband or intended husband, whether before or after marriage, respecting the property of any woman he may marry——"

I propose to add after the words "may marry" the words "or have married."

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 21, after the word 'marry' to insert the words 'or have married.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The next Amendment is in Subsection 2—

"(2) But if she dies an infant any covenant or disposition by her husband shall bind or pass any interest, larger than an estate or interest for his life, in any property of hers to which he may become entitled on her death."

I propose to insert after the word "husband" the words "contained in the settlement or agreement." That is the meaning of the clause, and the Amendment is merely to make that clear.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'husband' to insert the words 'contained in the settlement or agreement.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The next Amendment is designed to state clearly that which is intended by the Bill. I propose to leave out, from Subsection 2, which I have already read, the words "larger than an estate or interest for his life," and to insert, at the end of the subsection, the words, "and which he could have bound or disposed of if this Act had not been passed."

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, lines 25 and 26, to leave out the words 'larger than an estate or interest for his life,' and in line 27, after the word 'death' to insert the words 'and which he could have bound or disposed of if this Act had not been passed.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4:—

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I move an Amendment in this clause to provide that the Bill shall not apply to Scotland. I cannot imagine what the result would be if an Act relating to English conveyancing law were to apply to Scotland.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'eight' to insert '(3) This Act shall not extend to Scotland.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 150.)

PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (No. 2) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD STEWARD (EARL BEAUCHAMP): My Lords, the object of this Bill is to extend a principle which has been already admitted in other Acts, and which has been found to work with very good effect. There are precedents in the Habitual Drunkards Act, 1879, and the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, under which a justice of the peace may, instead of sending the person before him to a retreat or to prison, commit him to the custody of some fit person to be detained for the period for which he is remanded. This principle has also been enacted under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, and the Probation of First Offenders Act, 1887. This Bill, however, goes rather further, in that it will apply to others besides those who are before the Court for the first time. The most important part of the Bill, perhaps, beyond what I have already mentioned, is the permission which is given to Courts to provide for the payments of a salary to probation officers. Your Lordships will see in Clause 3 a provision that the salary shall be paid by the authority out of the funds from which the salary of the clerk to the justices is paid. I am sure that those of your Lordships who have had experience upon petty sessional divisions or upon benches in towns, even small towns, will realise that the provisions of this Bill are likely to be of very great benefit in a large number of cases. I myself have heard cases in connection with which

I have regretted that it has been necessary to send the accused to prison. This Bill will obviate that. It is recognised by all reformers that the more you can segregate offenders the better it is for them in the future, and inasmuch as this Bill goes some way in that direction I hope your Lordships will give it a Second Reading, and allow it to pass without Amendment.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

THE EARL OF MEATH: My Lords, this Bill can hardly be called a first-class measure in the ordinary sense of the term. It is not one which creates a great deal of popular excitement, or which, before it reaches your Lordships' House, is heralded by the shouts of politicians and the clash of Parliamentary steel. But all who are interested in social reform must feel highly grateful to His Majesty's Government for having introduced this Bill, and I may also, in parenthesis, add the Bill which is to follow, and which is also to be proposed by the Lord Steward. I am delighted to find that His Majesty's Government have discovered that a useful measure need not necessarily be a lengthy or contentious one. I have for years felt that a great deal might be done if only the Government of the day would, instead of looking simply and solely for great party contentious Bills, see whether they could not do good by simple and non-contentious legislation. There can be no doubt whatever that this Bill will prevent crime, and to a large extent empty our jails. Therefore I venture to say that if the Government, instead of producing lengthy and contentious programmes of shop-front legislation, of which not a tithe can pass, were to devote themselves to small and useful and non-contentious measures like this they would add greatly to the happiness of the great mass of the people.

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

RELEASED PERSONS (POOR LAW) RELIEF BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Earl Beauchamp.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, the subject with which this Bill deals has been before the public for something like twenty-two years, and I believe the Bill itself has no opponent of any sort or kind. Its object is to give relief to the rates of districts in which prisons are situated by giving powers for the sending of distressed prisoners, who, on release seek refuge in the nearest workhouse, to districts more properly charged with them. In Wandsworth alone no less than seventy-nine prisoners became chargeable to the rates of the borough, although none of the offences for which they were sentenced were committed within the Wandsworth Poor-Law union. I hope that your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading, and will not consider any Amendment necessary.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order.)

LORD DENMAN moved to amend Clause 1, Sub-section (1)—by leaving out the word "recognised" before the words "assistants of the clerks of petty sessions at Cork and Belfast," and inserting, at the end of the clause, the words "and approved of by the Lord Lieutenant." He explained that this Amendment had been drafted to meet the point urged at an earlier stage by Lord Ashbourne.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 1, line 9, to leave out the word 'recognised' and in line 12, after the word 'Act' to insert the words 'and approved of by the Lord-Lieutenant.'"—(*Lord Denman.*)

LORD ASHBOURNE said that if the Irish Office thought the words moved by the noble Lord met the point adequately and prevented the possibility of doubt he was satisfied.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

THE SUGAR CONVENTION.

The EARL of DENBIGH: My Lords, I rise to call attention to Papers recently circulated relating to communications from the Colonies protesting against any weakening of the Brussels Sugar Convention, and to the reasons put forward by His Majesty's Government in justification of their policy on this question. I had this Notice on the paper for last week, but on receiving a representation from noble Lords opposite that it was desirable to postpone it in view of discussions being carried on elsewhere, I took it off; but when I found that the question was coming on in the House of Commons on the Foreign Office Vote, I replaced it with the assent of the noble Lord opposite.

Before this House is too much occupied with other business I wish to call your Lordships' attention to this important question, because unfortunately there is no doubt that the general public do not thoroughly comprehend the present situation. I know that it is a somewhat complex one, and the difficulty has been that in this country we have invariably regarded the question simply and solely from the consumers' point of view, and therefore the general public, beyond the question of getting cheap sugar, have never paid any attention to the matter. As your Lordships know, the Convention about which so much dispute has arisen was an agreement come to for the purpose of dealing with bounties and foreign cartels. Bounties are pretty well understood, but, unfortunately, cartels are not. I daresay there are a certain number of noble Lords in this House who do not fully appreciate the manner in which the foreign cartels have hitherto worked, and I will go further and say that there may be some members of the Cabinet who would be indisposed to stand a very searching cross-examination as to the ways and methods of the foreign cartels.

Only a few days ago I was speaking to a very influential and well-known Member of your Lordships' House, a noble Lord of great experience, and he expressed the opinion that there did not seem to be any probability whatever of bounties being re-established, because he said he did not believe that foreign countries wished to re-establish them. I quite agreed with him, but I said, "What about cartels?" "Oh," he replied, "that is a technical question," and he thereupon dismissed the subject. That is just a sample of the way in which it is too often regarded. Though the question of the cartels may be a technical one, it is of just as much importance in dealing with the present situation as the question of bounties; in fact, I think it is more important, because cartels have done more harm than the actual bounties. And when I say that they have done more harm, it is important to remember the exact matter which the Convention was devised to remedy—namely, the constant selling in the markets of the world of sugar under cost price, thereby greatly injuring the cane industry in foreign countries, and more especially in our own Colonies.

I wish, therefore, without any desire to be wearisome, to remind your Lordships what this question of cartels is. The cartels were formed in Austria and in Germany; they were great trusts, or combinations, or rings, whatever you like to call them, of the manufacturers of those two countries, who combined together and bound themselves, under very strict penalties, not to sell sugar in their respective countries under a certain price; and by means of this combination they screwed up the price of sugar to a point just below that at which it would have paid other people to have imported sugar to compete with them. By means of having a high protective duty in these countries the cartels made very large profits, but they were only able to work satisfactorily to themselves by means of this high protective duty, or, in other words, by having a high surtax—the surtax being defined in the document of the Brussels Convention as being the difference between the Excise duty and the Import duty.

This Convention was passed for the purpose of dealing with the selling of sugar below cost price. The bounties were dealt with by the countries agreeing to bind themselves not to give bounties in either direct or indirect forms; and the cartels were dealt with by the various countries joining the Convention agreeing to limit the surtax to six francs per 100 kilos, or 2s. 6d. per cwt. With the surtax thus limited the cartels ceased to be profitable combinations and automatically went into abeyance. It is just as well to remember, too, that the profits made by the cartels in selling to their own consumers were very large indeed. In Austria, I believe, in one favorable year, the cartel made as much as £3,000,000 profit, and in Germany about £5,000,000. The result of that was greatly to increase production and encourage the cultivation and establishment of sugar factories, because, naturally, when these large profits were being made, people were constantly wishing to come in and join the cartels. The consequence was that Austria and Germany produced far more sugar than they could use themselves, and the surplus was dumped on the English market, and owing to the large profits they were making, they were able to sell that surplus sugar at less than cost price. It was this situation which the Convention was brought about to deal with. I hope I have been able to make the situation clear. It is very important that it should be thoroughly understood, and I would point out that these cartels are only in a state of suspended animation. Their organisation is still in existence, and they are ready to get to work again if only they can persuade their respective countries to increase the import duty to a point above 6 francs per 100 kilos. Your Lordships will see, therefore, that these cartels did just as much harm as, if not more harm than, the actual bounties themselves; and yet, unfortunately, in the minds of the British public, the cartels are almost wholly ignored, and people speak of the question as if it affected nothing but the bounties.

There is another point to which I wish to call attention—namely, that these, as I would call them, cut-throat prices were absolutely killing the cane industry in foreign countries and in the Colonies, and I submit that this was entirely contrary to the interests of the consumers in this country. In consequence of the encouragement which has been given to the production of sugar on the Continent of Europe, Austria and Germany alone at the present moment supply about 4,000,000 tons of sugar—that is, very nearly one-third of the total production of the world; and, taking into consideration France and other countries that grow beet, I think you will find that very nearly one half of the whole sugar production of the world is grown on the Continent of Europe. This is contrary to the interests of consumers, because it places them at the mercy of any drought or bad season in the principal beet-growing countries, and at such times you are certain to have speculative prices and to have the general markets upset. The abnormal prices that obtained in 1905 are an instance.

I would remind the House of what happened in regard to the question of cotton. Owing to a short crop in the United States and to great speculation in Wall Street, cotton a few years ago was forced up to a price which caused the greatest possible alarm in Lancashire and brought disaster to that important industry. What was the result? All our important cotton users began busying themselves to see in what other parts of the world cotton could be grown. The West African Cotton Growing Association was formed, and the question was investigated in Egypt, in Rhodesia, and in East Africa, so as to prevent the cotton markets of Lancashire being too much dependent on the United States supply. Surely the same thing applies to sugar, and it is most shortsighted of the consumers of this country to continue to favour a system which has in the past had the effect of centering the sugar supply of the world on the Continent of Europe, and thus making themselves liable to these fluctuating prices.

I was the other day somewhat severely castigated by the noble Marquess who leads this House and by the noble Lord the Under-Secretary for State for Foreign Affairs for daring to insinuate that the policy of His Majesty's Government on this question had been actuated mainly by political motives; and I was told that their action had been simply and solely due to their adherence to the great principles of Free Trade. I do not wish to say anything to hurt the feelings of the noble Lords opposite, but I am afraid I must confess I am entirely unrepentant, and I venture the assertion again that the action which has lately been taken by His Majesty's Government with regard to this particular question has been mainly owing to Party exigencies and to the statements that were made in the country by many politicians previous to the general election. I say that their action has been mainly in consequence of what have been called the "good-humoured exaggerations" of politicians—a phrase which fell from the noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and which, used in conjunction with what went on at the last general election, is destined to take its place in history second only to that other famous phrase, "terminological inexactitude."

Well, what happened? When that great rise in sugar took place, naturally there was great disturbance to all our markets. The Convention was cursed, no consideration whatever was paid to the real causes which brought it about, and every one in the then Opposition immediately proceeded to direct their attention, and the attention of the public, to the great desirability of destroying the Convention on the very earliest opportunity. The result of that was that when the present Government came in they found themselves very considerably tied up by these "good-humoured exaggerations," and they had considerable pressure put upon them by their followers. Speeches were made on this subject by many prominent members of the Government previous to the general election, and by none more than by the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Lloyd-George. I have seen several speeches of his in which he declared that if foreign countries were foolish enough to give bounties, and so provide us with cheap sugar, we should be very foolish if we did not avail ourselves of them. Lurid accounts were given of the large amount of sugar which was kept out of the country owing to the prohibition of sugar from the countries which did not join the Convention, and we were told that all this was greatly to the detriment of the sugar-using trades.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Under-Secretary have both acknowledged that they do not want the bounties and cartels to revive, and they admit the evils of both of these systems. Therefore it is evident that the Government now adopt a different attitude from what they did before the general election. It is possible that the President of the Board of Trade may have got somewhat wiser since he took office and came into contact with the permanent officials and with official documents. I believe that is a thing that very often happens to platform politicians. But the curious thing is they never will admit it. They prefer that the British public should consider them absolutely incapable of learning anything from official documents, or of profiting at all from sources of information from which they were previously debarred. It is quite evident that the situation now is that the Government do not want to destroy the Convention, but they have not got the moral courage to get up and say so. Therefore they are bound to do something for the purpose of performing the Chinese operation which is known as "saving their face"; and so I presume the brilliant idea occurred that the best way out of it would be to denounce the penal provisions of the Convention—the provisions which alone made the Convention effective—while at the same time saying they had no desire to injure the Convention at all; and, of course, as the public has been led to believe that these penal provisions were keeping large quantities of sugar out of the country that denunciation could naturally be done in the name of free trade and great *kudos* would necessarily accrue to His Majesty's Government.

I submit that His Majesty's Government must have known that no possible good to the trade of the country could come from denouncing these penal provisions, and I shall venture to show why. We had a statement from Lord Denman not very long ago in which he stated, very positively, that in his opinion the keeping ouf of sugar from the Argentine and from Russia encouraged speculation, and was greatly conducive to the high prices which existed in 1905; but in the House of Commons last week the statement was made on behalf of His Majesty's Government, in reply to a question, that in 1903, previous to the passing of the Convention, the amount of sugar brought in from the Argentine was only 4,000 tons. I respectfully submit that to say that the non-advent of 4,000 tons in a market of 2,000,000 tons could have had any effect on the price is too ridiculous a contention to merit further notice. Then, with regard to Russian sugar, it was stated in the House of Commons, in the same answer, that it was difficult to obtain absolute statistics because a great deal of Russian sugar came through Germany. I believe that is the case, but I am informed by competent people in the City, who know what they are talking about, that it would be very safe to say that the amount of sugar which came from Russia was well under 20,000 tons. But, whatever the amount may have been, the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs admitted, in the last speech he made in this House on the subject, that the stopping of Russian sugar did not alter the supplies available; and that, I submit, effectively disposes of the rest of Lord Denman's argument.

The noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was himself extremely illogical and contradictory in his last speech. When I ventured to point out, in support of the agitation for the establishment of the beet sugar industry in this country, the great good it would do in providing employment in rural districts and improving the cultivation of the land, the noble Lord said that the good results to which I alluded would be infinitesimal alongside the advantages given to the trade of the country by the absolute free entry of sugar. The only possible way in which the sugar trade of the country could benefit would be by a permanent and very considerable cheapening of the raw material. I admit, of course, that it is of great advantage to many manufacturing interests to have raw material as cheap as possible, but, at all events in this particular instance, I entirely fail to see why the confectioners and sugar-using trades of this country should necessarily be allowed to make to the great harm of other people larger profits than they do at present.

But what I ask is, would sugar be considerably cheaper? I submit that it could not possibly be cheaper on account of the advent of sugar from the non-Convention countries, because His Majesty's Government admit, in so many words, that no restriction of supplies has been brought about by the imposition of this penal clause; and if there has been no restriction of supplies in this way, how can there be any addition to the supplies by dropping the penal clause? And if the supplies are not very greatly increased, how can the prices be so lowered as to bring about these wonderful benefits to the sugar-using trades? A great lowering of price could not possibly arise simply and solely through sugar coming from the non-Convention countries; the only way in which it could occasionally arise would be by recourse to bounties and cartels—the system which did occasionally produce exceptionally low prices, but which His Majesty's Government are themselves condemning and which they say they do not wish to see re-established. I submit that the position taken up by His Majesty's Government on this particular point is supremely ridiculous.

The Under-Secretary the other day, after he had driven himself into various corners in the course of his speech, knocked out all the arguments that had hitherto been used. He said—

> "If it were asked how, in view of the fact mentioned, the prohibition of Russian sugar in this country could affect the price we had to pay for our sugar or could really limit our supply, the answer would be that any interference with the natural flow of commodities along the routes which they follow when left to themselves must involve friction and must tend to make them more expensive."

The noble Lord added—

> "A case may easily arise, when sugar prices are unduly inflated by speculation, when it may be desirable for an importer to procure sugar from a special source which may for the moment be the most favourable one."

So that, practically, is the only possible advantage which the noble Lord leaves to be derived from the dropping of these penal provisions. But who would be the people who would import sugar under these conditions? Not the confectioner, not the jam maker, but the big broker in the City, who might possibly be able to snatch a bargain at times of inflated prices. But these gentlemen are not philanthropists; they do not go to Mincing Lane for the benefit of their health; and is it supposed that if an importer obtained a parcel of sugar under these conditions he would not sell it at the best market price he could get and put the profit in his pocket? Therefore I say that when you come to analyse it, the sole possible advantage which is left as a consequence of the dropping of the penal clause is that particular instance to which I have referred.

I do not know why it is that His Majesty's Government use these extraordinarily thin and threadbare arguments in support of this policy—arguments so contradictory that to an exceptionally stupid and dense person like myself they appear to be almost nonsensical and pedantic. The only conclusion I can come to is that His Majesty's Government are the unfortunate victims of something; they know perfectly well that they have no case and that their arguments are absolutely untenable, but they have to do something and make the best of it. If the dropping of the penal clause was going to do any good, that good might very fairly be set against any evil effects which might result; but I submit I have shown to your Lordships that it cannot possibly do any good and that it may do a great deal of harm. This Convention is extremely unpopular with the sugar interests on the Continent, on account of the fact that it has curtailed very greatly the profits they made under the system which the Convention destroyed; and although, possibly, the countries now negotiating at Brussels may consent to go on with the Convention for another five years, this action of His Majesty's Government is a standing invitation to the cartels of Austria and Germany, and more especially to the Austrian ones, to agitate all they can during the next five years for the purpose of obtaining an increase in the import duty to their own advantage at the end of that time.

You have no guarantee whatever as to what may happen in five years time. No wonder that we have recently had circulated by the Government this remarkable series of protests [Papers relating to the Brussels Sugar Convention, Cd. 3565] from our different Colonies, showing the alarm and the indignation which they feel. This correspondence begins with a letter received from the New Colonial Company, dated as far back as May 15th of last year, in which they state that they are going to expend £4,000 on the erection of a hospital for the benefit of their sugar coolies, and they very much wish to know what the policy of His Majesty's Government is going to be. It would be interesting to know what answer was sent by the Colonial Office. Then follow letters from Antigua and Jamaica. From Jamaica comes the request to His Majesty's Government to permit the Government of that Colony to endeavour to negotiate with the United States a reciprocal agreement, whereby the American Government would, after September, 1901, admit sugar from that island into the United States on preferential terms. Therefore the policy of His Majesty's Government does not seem to be doing much towards promoting commercial intercourse between Jamaica and this country.

Then you have strong despatches from Barbados and British Guiana, where the sugar industry is the principal industry of the Colony, and where the greatest possible alarm has been felt at the general state of insecurity which has been brought about by His Majesty's Government. It is also remarkable to notice that there are despatches from nearly all the other Colonies, both sugar-producing and non-sugar-producing, showing that the opinion is pretty unanimous on this point. Protests have come in from chambers of commerce all over the Empire, and it is not too much to say that the greatest alarm has been created by the action of His Majesty's Government, who will have absolutely nothing whatever to show for it. I know that the Conference at Brussels is sitting at the present moment, and, in the interest of the sugar producers and of the possible establishment of the sugar beet industry in this country, I most sincerely hope that the Convention will be renewed. It would be a disastrous thing if it were not. But I repeat, that, even if it is renewed, no possible benefit can come to this country from the action of the Government and the state of uncertainty with regard to the possible re-establishment of the cartels that has been created, and will continue for the next five years until the Convention again comes up.

*LORD NUNBURNHOLME: My Lords, when the Brussels Sugar Convention was first mooted I took a great personal interest in opposing it on behalf of the east coast ports of England. The noble Lord has made a very good theoretical speech, but the practical business question to be considered is whether it is better for this country to have sugar cheap or sugar dear. This is practically what it comes to. In 1903 there was a big meeting held at Hull, presided over by a very strong Unionist, the object being to call upon the local Members of Parliament to do all they could to oppose this Convention. The resolution that was passed was in these terms, that while protesting, on national grounds, against the ratification of the Convention, the meeting regarded with especial alarm the fact that important local interests would be injured by its operations, and it was felt that the Convention was a move of Mr. Chamberlain to divert the sugar trade from the Continent to the West Indies, as a protectionist measure.

Why should we support the West Indies against our own people? Perhaps the noble Lord and the House generally are not aware that the trade with the Sugar Bounty countries, France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany in sugar alone, in the year 1901, amounted to 1,574,000 tons, whereas the exports from the West Indies were only 34,000 tons; that is 34,000 tons against 1,574,000 tons which came into this country at a low rate for the benefit of all the industries connected with sugar. The West Indies, at the same time that they were exporting 34,000 tons of sugar to England, were exporting 105,000 tons to the Untied States. The exports in coal from the United Kingdom to France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany were £9,629,000, and the exports to the West Indies £48,000. The West Indies do not want our coal, except what is used for bunkering steamers. They do not want our blankets. What do they want? They practically want very little.

The Member for West Birmingham, in his zeal to support the population of the West Indies, thought it desirable to encourage trade there, and the Government now have to pay £40,000 a year for a line of steamers to bring bananas from the West Indies to England. We did very well without bananas in times gone by. As we see in the streets of London, the importation of bananas has produced a taste for them, but I suppose human beings can only eat a certain quantity of fruit, and it would have been more in the interests of this country if they had kept to apples and pears. We must remember the enormous trade we do with the sugar-producing countries, and the millions of pounds worth of coal they buy from us. This year, there has been an enormous increase in the export trade to Continental ports, and the increase has been so great that the local railways have been entirely unable to cope with the traffic. The consequence is that steamers arriving in the Humber ports have to lie out in the river until room can be found for them in the docks, and until the railways are able to deal to some extent with the traffic. Those are facts; they are not theories.

To make sure of my ground, I telegraphed to the chairman of the meeting to which I have referred, and this gentleman, who is largely concerned in the question, replies that he is as opposed to the Sugar Convention now as as he was four years ago. I do not know that I can say anything stronger. I look upon this from a practical business point of view. It simplifies itself into this: are we to support the West Indies against our own people? Are we to endeavour to induce agriculturists in this country to lay out thousands of pounds in an attempt to grow sugar beet? What would have happened this year, with the season that we have had, to those who had put their money into such a speculation? It would have been a total failure. It is clear that this country is not suitable for the growing of sugar beet.

I am in favour of as little protection as possible and as much dumping as possible. Let us get everything as cheaply as we can. I am sure that in the long run that will be found to be the feeling of the country. I am still at a loss to know what the noble Earl who has raised this question to-day wishes. Does he wish us to support the West Indies, the entire population of which is very little more than that of one of our biggest cities, or does he wish encouragement given to the cultivation of sugar beet in England? We have plenty of things to grow without undertaking sugar beet, and I think that, on the whole, the people of this country will feel that the Government are acting wisely in putting a stop to all the troubles that the Brussels Sugar Convention has undoubtedly led to.

My statistics are for 1901, when the United Kingdom imported only 34,160 tons of sugar from the West Indies against 1,574,750 tons from France, Belgium, Holland and Germany, the Sugar Bounty countries; at the same time the West Indies exported 105,453 tons of sugar to the United States, showit is their natural and best market. Again, we exported 15,542,743 tons of coal to the Sugar Bounty countries against 56,725 tons of coal to the West

Indies, and we bought (imported) from the Sugar Bounty countries a total of sugar and merchandise of about £140,000,000 against £1,330,000 from the West Indies. Again, we exported to the Sugar Bounty countries £84,297,248 of coal merchandise against £2,102,122 to the West Indies. The Sugar Bounty countries thus by our purchases of sugar are enabled to reciprocate and help us to maintain our shipping lines and colliery output. The West Indies can do little or nothing. I hope the Board of Trade will give the statistics for 1906.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): My Lords, I must confess that I, like the noble Lord behind me, feel somewhat doubtful as to what the noble Earl has desired specially to put before us this evening. I proposed to reply because I found on the Paper a statement that the noble Earl was going to call attention to certain communications from the Colonies. The noble Earl made, as he always does, an eloquent speech, full of knowledge of his subject, and, if I may do so, I would like to express my personal thanks to him for the lucid way in which he described the system of cartels.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I also put down on the Paper that I would call attention to the reasons put forward by His Majesty's Government in justification of their policy on this question.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: I am quite aware of that, but the noble Earl placed the other matter first in his Notice, and one naturally supposed that that was to be at any rate the jumping-off ground. But he did not refer to those Papers until just at the end of his speech. I admit that then the noble Earl did say one or two words on that subject. I was beginning to feel that I should have little to say, but as the noble Earl has referred to the communications from the Colonies, I shall venture to say a few words on that subject. As to the rest, I have only to remark that we have already had two debates on this subject this session in your Lordships' House, in both of which the noble Earl who initiated them told us that we were going entirely wrong, and in which he probably said, as he has said to-day, that our action was entirely actuated by political motives. All I can say on that point is that we have made our statement. I think we have taken the only action that was open to us as a Government professing free trade principles, and we are not ashamed of having done so.

With regard to the Papers to which the noble Earl has alluded, although there are expressions in favour of the noble Earl's views, the Papers also contain other significant expressions. I will quote one only. In a resolution passed by the Barbados Agricultural Society it is stated that—

> "While the Convention has not led to a rise in the average price of sugar, it has restored the financial stability of the industry, and as a consequence sugar-planters are able to obtain capital for improving machinery whereby the quality of their sugar can be adapted to the changing needs of the market and the cost of production can be gradually reduced."

I quote that resolution to show that it is stability which has given an impetus to the sugar industry in the West Indies, and especially to the improvement of machinery. But stability cannot be said to depend on protection alone. I should be inclined to argue that protection was apt to injure stability. I believe that many instances of that kind could be quoted. At any rate, the want of stability is disastrous to any industry. If we want to secure stability we must take into account all those who are interested in the industry with which we are concerned. Therefore we must take into account, not only the producers in the Colonies, but also the consumers in the United Kingdom, and the great confectionery industries to which cheap sugar is of the highest importance. I think we can safely argue that it is detrimental to the Colonies that the democracy of this country should possess the idea that the majority in this country should suffer for the sake of the minority in the Colonies. The friction which arises out of those causes must be avoided, because nothing is more calculated to bring about those unsettled conditions from which the sugar like any other industry is apt to suffer. It is from that point of view that the action taken by His Majesty's Government proceeds. What happened was this. The permanent Commission established at Brussels under the Sugar Convention met on 25th July to consider the suggestion of His Majesty's Government that, if the United Kingdom could be relieved from the obligation to enforce the penal provision of the Convention, they would be prepared not to give notice on 1st September next of their intention to withdraw on 1st September, 1908—notice which otherwise they would be bound to give. At the meeting of the Commission a draft protocol was drawn up for submission to the different Governments on the understanding that, if accepted, it would be signed before September 1st next. This draft protocol provides for the modification of the Convention, and, at the same time, for its continuance. It meets, on the one hand, the wish of his Majesty's Government to be relieved from penalising bounty-fed sugar, and, on the other hand, it enables the other Powers to reconsider their position, should they be of opinion that their interests are suffering.

The Commission decided that the text of the protocol should not be published until the Governments had decided whether they would accept it. and it is for that reason, and not because we wish to burke the matter in any way, that we have been anxious that the debate should be postponed. I hope the action which his Majesty's Government have taken will safeguard the stability on which the sugar industry of our sugar-producing colonies depends. The noble Earl made some references to an incident in Lancashire and the failure of the cotton crop. He is, no doubt, well aware that one of the results of that incident was that the growing of cotton was taken up in the West Indies as well as in other places. I, for one, think that nothing will give greater stability to the West Indies and to the industries of the West Indies than that their eggs should not all be put in one basket. For that reason I have seen with great satisfaction the growth of the fruit trade, and I entertain still greater hopes in regard to cotton-growing in those colonies. From all accounts which have reached me, it appears that in many of the Islands there is ground well fitted for growing cotton of excellent quality. I hope that, if that enterprise is successful, we shall see those colonies, in spite of any difficulties that may arise in their sugar trade, once more enjoying the prosperity which has perhaps been denied to them for some time.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the noble Earl who has just sat down and the noble Lord who preceded him have thought it wise, in their own interests, to attempt to import into this discussion all the prejudice which hangs round the fiscal controversy. But I would like to remind your Lordships that this question of the abolition of the sugar bounties was long anterior to the fiscal controversy. The abolition of sugar bounties has been advocated, not by those who are called protectionists, but by ardent free traders. I believe Mr. Gladstone himself was in favour of the abolition of sugar bounties. I am quite sure of this, that the Government which negotiated the proposals of the Sugar Convention contained such men as the Duke of Devonshire, Lord George Hamilton, and my noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh, all of whom, as your Lordships are well aware, proved at a very important and significant moment their attachment to the principles of free trade. Therefore I am not prepared to admit that those who favour the maintenance of the Brussels Convention are to be labelled with the name of protectionists.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: I did not say so.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: But the noble Lord behind the Government Bench said so, or used words to that effect. Even the Government themselves do lip service to the interests of the producers as well as to those of the consumers. That fact stands on the face of their despatch, in the opening words of which they say they are—

> "bound to consider the interests of the consumers and producers in the United Kingdom and her Colonies."

Having said that much, that is all they do for the producers so far as the Colonies are concerned. The rest of their policy is confined to looking after the interests of the consumers and the consumers alone. What can be the motive for adopting this policy? Why could not the Government have left things alone? They were not called upon to make themselves responsible for the Brussels Convention. That was done before they assumed office, and all they had to do was to leave it alone. All that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies could find to say on that subject was that it was inconsistent with the faith of a free trade Government that they should continue the Convention. I notice that his colleague, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, speaking in another place, said:—

> "We never denied that under the Sugar Convention benefits might accrue to those parts of the Empire which produce sugar. But what we did contend was that no benefit to a particular part of the Empire should be purchased at the cost of the community as a whole."

That appears to be the policy of His Majesty's Government. I am surprised, if they take that view, that they are content with the consequences of the Sugar Convention, even though its sanctions are by their action to be abolished. If they really think the interests of the consumers are alone to be sought, why do they not take steps to persuade foreign countries to re-establish the bounties, to get rid of which we were at such pains?

I would refer your Lordships to another quotation, one of an earlier date, but not many years old:—

> "The benefit which the British Empire as a whole derives from any lowering of the price of sugar due to the operation of the bounty system is too dearly purchased by the injury that system imposes on a limited class—namely, your Majesty's West Indian and other subjects dependent on the sugar industry."

Observe the phraseology of that quotation and compare it with the observation I have just quoted from the speech of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in another place. According to Sir Edward Grey, no benefit to a particular part of the Empire should be purchased at the cost of the community as a whole; but, according to the quotation I have just read, the benefit which the British Empire as a whole derives from any lowering of the price of sugar due to the operation of the bounty system is too dearly purchased by the injury that that system imposes on the sugar-producing Colonies. I have read those two quotations, because the latter quotation is signed by no less a person than the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs himself. The extract I have quoted is from the Report of the West Indian Commission, of which Sir Edward Grey was a member, and though there was a slight difference of opinion between the Commissioners on the question of retaliatory duties, yet in respect of the quotation I have given to the House there was no difference of opinion. It is contained in the unanimous part of the Report, and all the Commissioners committed themselves to it.

I wonder what it is that has caused the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to change his opinion. He has not confided that to either House of Parliament. Has he really changed his opinion, or is it one of those wonderful compromises at which Governments arrive? I cannot help thinking that that is so, because there was a significant phrase in the Secretary of State's speech in another place about the harmony of the Government. I always distrust Ministers when they begin to advertise their own harmony. There are two ways of achieving harmony. One is for all to agree; the other is for those who disagree to sink their opinions; and perhaps that is what has happened in regard to His Majesty's Government.

One other observation founded on the Report of the West Indian Commission. The majority of the Commissioners were against countervailing duties. As your Lordships are aware, there is no question of countervailing duties so far as the Brussels Convention is concerned. The penal method adopted was that of prohibition and not countervailing duties. But it is interesting to note the objections which the Commissioners in 1898 had to countervailing duties. One was the uncertainty felt by the Commissioners as to whether or not that policy would save the West Indies. No doubt they had a right to be uncertain; but we have no such right. We have before us Papers showing that Colony after Colony bears witness to the success of the Convention. Colony after Colony declares that the Brussels Convention has been a conspicuous success, that it has saved the West Indies, and that its abolition would seriously prejudice their prosperity. In some of the despatches the representatives of these Colonies speak of the ruin which will follow upon the destruction of the Brussels Convention, so that the doubt which Sir Edward Grey and his colleagues had in 1898 no longer exists and that particular reason against countervailing duties may be eliminated.

At this hour and in this small House I shall not go into the question of the most-favoured-nation clause. Our Government dealt with the difficulty of most-favoured-nation treatment in connection with the Convention, and it was very easily disposed of. It was agreed that the most-favoured-nation question was not touched by the Brussels Convention. There was another point—the loss to the consumer in England which countervailing duties would involve. That was all that the noble Lord who spoke just now from the back bench opposite cared about. His whole idea of Imperial policy was what would happen to the consumer in England. But this is what Sir Edward Grey and his colleagues signed in 1898—

> "On the whole we think, as we have already indicated, that the loss to the British consumer, if it were the only matter to be considered, might reasonably be accepted in view of the importance of removing the disadvantages under which the West Indian producers at present labour."

So that Sir Edward Grey held that the interests of the consumer ought not to be allowed, if they stood alone, to weigh against the interests of the West Indies.

LORD NUNBURNHOLME: I raised the question of the export of coals. That is a very large portion of this question. None of these Colonies buy our coals.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am afraid I do not quite see the relevance of the noble Lord's observation. If the West Indian Colonies sell sugar to us we have corresponding exports on which we make our profit, and we need not go further into the matter. So long as we have a trade with the West Indies it is certainly profitable both to the seller and to the buyer. Then there was the inconvenience to trade. That had to do with a large number of subjects, but in one respect at any rate that also may be eliminated from the consideration. One of the difficulties which the Commissioners anticipated was the sort of complication that hangs round what are called certificates of origin, but, as a matter of fact, there have been no such difficulties found in working the Brussels Convention. Therefore speaking as we do, not looking into the future as the Commissioners did, but having the actual working of the Convention to guide us, we say that we may eliminate nearly all the arguments which Sir Edward Grey and his colleagues put forward for objecting to countervailing duties.

Here we have a Convention which has worked very well, which has, in fact, saved the West Indies, and which has not presented the difficulties foreshadowed by the Commissioners, of whom Sir Edward Grey was one; yet the Government, colleagues of Sir Edward Grey, now wantonly and without reason wish to upset it simply that they may fulfil the rash and unwise pledges given during the general election. I have always tried on these questions to be moderate, and I believe that great harm is done to the cause of free trade, which I have at heart as much as noble Lords opposite, by this bigoted and unreasoning desire to work a theory to an undue extent. I do not believe that that is a sound or a practical policy, and I regret very much that the Government should have adopted it. I believe that the great fiscal controversy which has arisen, and which I profoundly regret, has been due as much to the stick-in-the-mud policy of the free traders in the past as to anything else, and if they had taken a reasonable view and had been willing to admit that it was consistent with free trade to stop these perfectly artificial advantages given to one particular trade, the fiscal controversy would probably never have arisen.

But the Government are not at the end of their difficulties. We do not know the full policy of the Government. It is possible that there are foreign negotiations still pending which make it necessary for them to exercise a certain reticence, and it is possible they may, by means of some diplomatic instrument, secure that the consequences of their having abandoned the penal clause may not be felt. That is possible, and, if so, except that it is rather a shabby proceeding to take advantage of all the benefits of the Sugar Convention without making yourselves responsible for it, I do not know that anything more need be said. But, if they have not secured the future safety of the West Indies, there will be very much to be said. The West Indies may be ruined, and, if they are, the Imperial Government will have to take over their debts. That represents a very large sum of money.

Then there is the welfare of the negro population. I think I caught an observation from the noble Lord who sits on the back bench opposite which I profoundly regret. He spoke with some kind of contempt of a policy which had at heart the welfare of the negro population. That is not the view which has been been taken by responsible statesmen on this subject. That was not the view taken by Sir Edward Grey and his colleagues, who spoke in the most emphatic way of our profound obligation in respect of the negro population in the West Indies. They did not go there of their own accord. Under British law they were compelled to go to the West Indies, and if we abandon them we shall incur a grave responsibility. If the fiscal policy of His Majesty's Government and the abandonment of the Brussels Convention should lead to the ruin of the West Indies, the Government will not only have to take over the debts of the West Indies, but also to undertake whatever course may be necessary with regard to the negro population. I think they are incurring a grave responsibility, unless, as I say, they intend to secure, by some diplomatic arrangement, the benefits of the Convention without making themselves responsible for it.

Although something may be done by such diplomatic instrument, what is most especially required is that confidence should be restored in the West Indies. Therefore it will have to be, not only a diplomatic instrument, but one which everybody can understand, so that the confidence of those engaged in the West Indian sugar industry and the credit of that industry shall be safeguarded. If one thing appears more prominently in these despatches than another it is that they value the credit and the confidence which the Sugar Convention gave them. The fact that once more, owing to the action of the Government, the whole thing is uncertain makes them anticipate a great disaster and the possibility that there will be no longer any investment of money there, and that the prosperity which has begun once more to shine on the West Indies may be destroyed. Therefore it is most important that credit should be restored and confidence reestablished. Whether to-night or at a future period, I hope something may be said which will reassure our West Indian fellow subjects, and show them that, after all, England has not abandoned them, that their interests will be safeguarded, and that, whether it be by means of the Brussels Convention or in some other way, they will not be allowed to suffer owing to the policy which, for different reasons, His Majesty's Government have thought good to follow.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, I hope the noble Marquess who has just addressed the House will not think it discourteous on my part if I do not attempt to follow him over the very wide field he has traversed. I would not really be justified in inflicting upon your Lordships, at a very short interval of time, a second edition of a speech which exactly a month ago I made in reply to the noble Earl who has brought forward this subject to-night. I regret, but I am not going to profess to be astonished, that my words did not carry conviction into the mind and heart of the noble Earl. As I said at the time, I feel that we on this side of the House and noble Lords opposite are separated by questions of principle, matters of long conviction, which probably will not be materially changed or altered in their texture by a very great number of debates either here or elsewhere.

I certainly was under the impression, when I saw the noble Earl's notice on the Paper, that, just as on a previous occasion he had desired to bring the grievances, as he thought them, of English producers, or, rather, intended producers, of beet, before the House, and on another occasion the general arguments connected with the whole of this question, on both of which occasions I had the honour of replying to the noble Lord, to-night he was going especially to bring forward the question of the Colonies, and for that reason my noble friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies decided, in keeping with the practice of your Lordships' House, to reply to the noble Earl. But what has really happened is this. The noble Earl and the noble Marquess appear to have come down to the House and made speeches they had prepared at, as I think, some comparatively remote time——

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Only this afternoon.

*LORD FITZMAURICE: Upon the assumption that by the month of July or August this year the wreckage of the Sugar Convention, which some of them had had a hand in negotiating, would, as it were, be lying about the Continent of Europe. But that is not the case. As I pointed out just a month ago, we are concerned in negotiations, and it is, of course, an exceedingly difficult and objectionable thing to make partial statements; and if I have anything to regret at all in this matter—and I am sure I am expressing the feelings of the Secretary of State also—it is that we have been obliged, owing to the necessities and courtesy of debate, to go even further than we would wish at this moment. Naturally we would desire, when the time came, to make a full and complete statement, and to inform the House of the exact terms contained in the protocol. That, however, is not the position in which exactly we have been placed; and we have gone, in consequence of the pressure that has been used, as far as we can go consistently with the interests of the situation.

A very large part of the speech to which we have just listened was taken up with matters of what may be called mere debate. Attempts were made to show that something which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said on the subject the other evening in the House of Commons did not agree with something that was written in the carefully selected extract which the noble Marquess produced from the Report, one of the signatories of which was Sir Edward Grey, of of the Commission that went to the West Indies. I really think I am expressing the feelings of noble Lords generally when I say that a question of this kind is really not benefited by such treatment. Many things have happened since Sir Edward Grey and his colleagues went to the West Indies and wrote that interesting Report, and the most important, the thing that has entirely modified the situation, is that the Sugar Convention has come into existence, and, whether we think that Convention was wise or unwise, it is impossible to discuss the question as if the Convention did not exist, or as if the matter at issue could be dealt with simply according as we may be free traders or protectionists. I am convinced that the passage on the subject in the speech of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons the other evening carried conviction to the minds of all who heard it. The passage is so important that, with your Lordships' permission, I will quote it. Sir Edward Grey said—

> "The late Government entered into that Convention on certain terms, having made certain arrangements with other Powers. We had to consider, when the time came for denouncing the Convention, whether so long as we could do it consistently with our own economic interests it was not our duty to cause the minimum of inconvenience to other Powers by, if possible, not disturbing the arrangements they have made. Our unconditional withdrawal must have meant considerable inconvenience to other Powers, and we thought it right, in the interests of good relations with them, that as we had, under the late Government, entered into a Convention with them, we should not denounce it unconditionally without making to them proposals which we felt sure would safeguard our own interests by freeing us from the penal clause, and yet securing our own interests with the minimum of disturbance to the other Powers."

Now what applies to foreign countries applies to the Colonies equally, perhaps even more. We cannot get away in either case entirely from the effects of our own action. To speak frankly, I am inclined to think there has been a tendency too much of late to use politically the argument about the danger to the trade of the West Indies and the indifference of Liberal Government on that point. I quite appreciate the anxiety which is entertained as to the trade of the West Indies, and no blame can possibly attach to the people of the West Indies for having organised themselves to do the best in their own interest; but there is no justification whatever for the charge that any Government, Liberal or otherwise, is indifferent to the fortunes of the West Indian Colonies. I cannot add anything to what has been said by the Secretary of State with regard to the present position of the negotiations. We are fully cognisant of the difficulties and dangers of the question; we have fully considered the subject of cartels; and I sincerely hope that when the time comes we shall be able to satisfy your Lordships that we have not treated the matter lightly or in any unworthy spirit.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 5th August, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [Lords]: Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—London County Council (Money) Bill; Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords]; Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords] without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law in regard to Debentures and Debenture Stock of Companies. [Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill [Lords.]

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LAND REGISTRY.

Account presented, of Receipts and Payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 286.]

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Forty-third detailed Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Marriages, Births, and Deaths in Ireland, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

Copy presented, of Return of Tenants (or their representatives) who had been evicted from three "Plan of Campaign" estates purchased or proposed to be purchased by the Estates Commissioners, and who have been reinstated in their former buildings, or provided with other holdings [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Berks), Further Return relative thereto [ordered 28th March, 1905; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 287.]

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) [EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred under any Act of the present Session to regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow. —(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

POOR LAW RELIEF (PAUPERS RELIEVED IN A YEAR AND PERIODS OF RELIEF).

Return ordered, "showing, in respect of each Poor Law union in England and Wales, the total number of persons (excepting lunatics in county and borough asylums, registered hospitals, and licensed houses, and casual paupers) who were relieved by the guardians at any time during the twelve months ending the 30th day of September, 1907, classified according to (a) the aggregate length of time for which each person received relief, and (b) the number of times on which relief was granted to each person, together with the following particulars respecting the persons so relieved:—(1) The number of men, women, and children, respectively, distinguishing (a) persons relieved singly, and (b) heads of families and their dependants; and (2) The number of adults and children, respectively, who received (a) indoor relief only, (b) outdoor relief only, distinguishing persons who received only medical relief, and (c) both indoor and outdoor relief."—(*Mr. John Burns.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Amalgamation of Irish Small Schools.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say by whom is the amalgamation of small schools considered a pressing necessity; whether a pair of schools in which there are in daily attendance over 100 children, sixty-two and thirty-nine, as in the case of the Kilmeedy schools, are included in those which it is considered a pressing necessity to amalgamate; and whether he can say how many pairs of separate schools in Ireland have an average attendance of less than 100.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The view that the amalgamation of many small schools in Ireland is desirable and necessary is held by the Irish Government and by the Commissioners of National Education themselves, and is strongly put forward in Mr. Dale's Report on Primary Education (Cd. 1981, of 1904). The Commissioners have not pressed for the amalgamation of the existing schools at Kilmeedy, but they cannot make building grants for separate new schools to supersede the existing schools. It may not be possible in many cases to effect the amalgamation of existing small schools, however proper that may be, but it is quite another thing to perpetuate the present undesirable system by building new separate schools in such cases. There are about 1,000 pairs of adjoining boys' and girls' schools in which the combined average attendance is less than 100.

Disorderly Houses—Removal of Girls over Fourteen Years of Age.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in cases where the police have raided a disorderly house no legal method exists of removing girls above the age of fourteen from their surroundings; and whether he can see his way to include provisions to meet these cases in his proposed legislation affecting children.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Under the existing law a girl found in a disorderly house can be committed to an industrial school only if she is under the age of fourteen. There would be great difficulty in extending this provision to girls above fourteen, as most of them would be girls of a class whom the managers of industrial or reformatory schools would not receive because they would be likely to corrupt the other inmates. I will consider, in connection with the proposed legislation for next session, whether it is possible to do anything in this matter.

Australian Meat Packing Establishments.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the investigations by the Army authorities into the Australian and New Zealand meat-packing establishments have been completed; and whether the result has tended to prove that the Australian meat is properly prepared in every way.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The Queensland Report has been received and is highly satisfactory; the New South Wales Report has not been received, but is expected by every mail.

Transfer of Military Pay Department from Pontefract to York.

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the War Office contemplate transferring the Military Pay Department from Pontefract to York; if he is aware that the town of Pontefract has made special efforts to afford facilities and conveniences for the depot and its requirements, and that the transference will be a severe loss to the town; and if he will give due weight to these considerations before authorising such transfer.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not at present in a position to give any information on this Question, but I can assure the hon. Member that the considerations which he suggests will not be overlooked.

Woolwich Arsenal Medal for V. Chapman and others.

MR. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will say for what reason the medal usually given to employees at Woolwich Arsenal who have been in the service of the Crown for twenty-five years has been withheld from V. Chapman and others, who have recently been dismissed and who have worked at Woolwich Arsenal for over twenty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The conditions attached to the grant of this medal are not under the control of the War Office, but I understand that the twenty-five years service must be wholly pensionable. The case referred to cannot be traced.

Aerial Flight.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the progress made by Foreign Powers in the solution of the problems of aerial flight, he will consider the desirability of increasing the grant for research on this subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The importance of this subject is recognised and experiments are in progress. It is not considered necessary or desirable to increase the grant of money available this year for this subject. My advisers and I are fully aware of the nature of the work that is being done elsewhere.

Reserve of Horses for Military Purposes.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the increasing numbers of motor vehicles, and the consequent decrease of horses, he can state definitely that necessary steps have been taken to secure that sufficient horses will be forthcoming for military purposes in case of war.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Will the hon. and gallant Member kindly refer to a reply given to a Question on this subject put by the hon. Member for the Oswestry Division of Shropshire on the 10th June, to which I have nothing to add.†

Marriage Fees in Malta.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention has been called to the heavy fees that are exacted in the case of marriages between Protestants and Roman Catholics in Malta; that where British soldiers have married Maltese girls the fees have amounted to as much as five pounds; and whether, seeing that civil marriages are now established in nearly all European countries and throughout the British Empire, he can explain why they are impossible in Malta.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The information before me shows that the Government fee on a marriage licence is one penny only. Some ministers of religion, I understand, collect fees for acting on behalf of the parties in procuring the licence, but I am not aware that the fees have ever amounted to so large an amount as five pounds. I will, however, inquire. I am not aware that there is any serious or urgent case for establishing civil marriage in Malta, and the Secretary of State has no intention of doing so in the absence of strong necessity for it.

Aliens Deported.

MR. THORNTON (Clapham): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what number of aliens have been deported from this country since the present Aliens Act came into operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Quarterly returns containing the number of expulsion orders made under the Aliens Act are laid before Parliament, and a statement dealing with the matter for the whole year 1906 has been presented to Parliament. These papers show that 287 expulsion orders were made against aliens in the year 1906, and 93 in the first quarter of the present year. The return for the second quarter of this year is on the point of presentation and shows 71 orders for the three months ending 30th June. I may add that in the month of July 25 orders have been made, bringing the total, since the commencement of the Act, up to 476.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxv., 1068.

Guns sent to Ordnance Factories for Repairs.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the number of guns sent to the Ordnance Factory for repair between the 1st July, 1903 and the 30th June 1904, between the 1st July, 1904, and the 30th June, 1905, and between the 1st July, 1906 and the 30th June, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The total numbers, down to and including 4-inch, are as follows :—

Between 1st July 1903, and 30th June, 1904, 75; Between 1st July, 1904, and 30th June 1905, 125; Between 1st July, 1906, and 30th June, 1907, 81.

"Ridley" Clerks at the Local Government Board.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the President of the Local Government Board how many Second Division clerks, appointed under the Order in Council, 21st March, 1890, are employed in the Local Government Board; how many clerks have been promoted to higher posts in the office from this class since its introduction over sixteen years ago; and the date of any such promotion.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The number of Ridley clerks on the establishment of the Local Government Board is at present 113. One Ridley clerk has been promoted to a staff clerkship, and the date of the promotion was 14th August, 1905.

MR. ALDEN: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has considered the representations made to him by the deputation which waited on him in May, 1906, and the communications since addressed to him, in which the Ridley clerks of the Second Division serving in his Department pointed out to him their unfavourable treatment as regards promotion compared with that accorded to clerks of their class in other Government offices; and whether he is in a position to give any reply.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The clerks referred to desired that some improvement should be made in their position. I have considered the representations made by them, but I have not at present seen my way to complying with them. I may, however, say that I am always desirous of doing what I properly can for the clerical staff of my Department.

Fees of Revising Barristers.

MR. COWAN (Surrey, Guildford): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury from what source are the revising barristers paid for the annual revision of lists of voters in the United Kingdom; what was the total amount paid to revising barristers for the year 1906 for England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively; how much was paid in 1906 to revising barristers for revising the lists of the county of Surrey, including the borough of Croydon; and how much was deducted in 1906 by the Treasury from local taxation moneys for costs of holding revising barristers' courts in England and Wales.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) In England and Wales half the cost of revising barristers is a final charge upon moneys voted by Parliament, and the other half is repaid by the local authorities under Section 9 of the County Electors Act, 1888. In Scotland there are no revising barristers. The work is done by the sheriffs, under 19 and 20 Vic., c. 58, s. 19, and is covered by their salaries, which are paid out of the Consolidated Fund. In Ireland, under Section 1 (4) of The Registration Ireland Act, 1898, as amended by Section 98 (9) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, the additional cost incurred through preparing a local government supplement to the list of Parliamentary electors is repaid by the county councils. Subject to this the revising barristers are paid out of the moneys voted by Parliament. The total amount paid to revising barristers for the year 1906 was as follows, viz. :—

	£	s.	d.
England and Wales .	25,462	10	0
Ireland	3,888	5	0
Total .	29,350	15	0

The amount paid to revising barristers in 1906 for revising the lists of the administrative county of Surrey and the borough of Croydon was £471 16s. 10d. The amount deducted from local taxation moneys for costs of holding revising barristers' courts in England and Wales in 1906 was £12,730 0s. 10d., irrespective of the sum of £1 4s. 2d. which was paid by the Council of the Isles of Scilly.

Income Tax Rebates.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, with regard to the right of income tax payers to claim the lower rate of 9d. in the £, it is proposed that any person who has already made a return, and does not receive the supplementary form, will have to pay 1s. in the £ unless he applies for a supplementary form within the next month (that is, August) to the local surveyor.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) No, Sir. Persons who are entitled to relief in respect of earned income and who have not already made a return of their total income for the purpose of claiming the existing statutory abatements will be required, as provided in Clause 19 (4) of the Finance Bill, to present their claims before 30th September. Supplementary forms for this purpose will be issued by the surveyors of taxes to persons who appear to be entitled to relief immediately after the passing of the Finance Bill, but, as I stated in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Aston Manor on 18th July, it will be advisable for anyone so entitled, who has not received a supplementary form by the end of the present month, to apply to the surveyor for his district, who will see that the omission is repaired.

Government Purchase of Consols and other Government Stocks.

MR. HYDE (Wednesbury): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has any objection to the publication, monthly, of the total amount of Consols and other Government stocks purchased in the preceding month for the Government through application of the surplus and sinking fund; and whether, having regard to the value of such information to the investing public, he will direct such information to be published.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I have carefully considered my hon. friend's suggestion, but I do not think that it would be to the public interest that I should pledge myself to the publication of a monthly return of the kind suggested, nor do I think it would be of much real value to the genuine investor.

Irish Land Commission Book-Keeping.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the books of the Irish Land Commission are kept in duplicate in order to enter up the names, advances, interest, &c., of every tenant; and, if so, whether he can arrange that the original registers shall be kept in Dublin, and all the work of the Irish Department done in Ireland as far as possible.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The books of the Irish Land Commission are not prepared in duplicate.

Improvement of Slips at Roads, County Kerry.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board is now in a position to carry out the necessary improvements to the slip at Roads, county Kerry; and, if so, when will the work be undertaken.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Congested Districts Board decided at their last meeting to expend a further sum of £200 upon the provision of a quay and additional boat-yard accommodation at Roads, but their funds will not enable them to undertake the work during the present financial year. The Board hope to have the work done next summer if the weather should permit.

Reinstatement of Mr. Thomas Brosnan, of Dromulton.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state if the Estates Commissioners have yet succeeded in securing the reinstatement of Mr. Thomas Brosnan, of Dromulton, county Kerry, in his farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The reply is in the negative.

Irish Education—Appointment of Junior Inspectors.

MR. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if one of the successful candidates, in connection with the recent appointments of junior inspector under the Commissioners of National Education, has declined the position; how many applicants were there for the appointment; do the Commissioners propose to fill the vacancy, and at what date; and what are the qualifications required by the Commissioners for this appointment of junior inspector.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. There were 158 applications for the appoint ment. The vacancy has already been filled by the appointment of the candidate who, in the Commissioners' opinion, was next in point of merit. Candidates for the position of junior inspector must be between twenty-three and thirty-five years of age, but in the case of national school teachers the age limit is extended to thirty-nine years. A good general education is required, and experience in the management of schools is considered desirable.

Report of Belfast Health Commission.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he could state the probable date on which the Report of the Belfast Health Commission would be issued; and whether it was proposed to issue any interim Report.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I understand from the Chairman of the Commission that the Report will probably not be ready before the end of September. It is not proposed to issue an interim Report.

Irish Government Banking Business.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the statement of Lord Rathmore, chairman of the Provincial Bank of Ireland, that the reason why more of the directors were not Irishmen was that it was not easy to find eligible men in Ireland to go to London to attend board meetings; if he can state whether this bank transacts any of the Irish Government's business; and, if so, whether, in view of the above statement, he will consider the advisability of transferring such Government business to an Irish bank, having an Irish board and its head offices in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I am not aware of any case in which this bank transacts Government business.

Charge Against Lisiniska Police Constables.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Head Constable Wilson and a constable from Listowel visited Lisiniska protection post in the month of October, 1904, and that the head constable after that visit reported that his bicycle received sixteen punctures and the constable's bicycle six punctures, and that the constables in the post (Coughlin and Kilcawley) punctured the bicycles or caused or encouraged some other person to puncture them, and that the constables so charged were punished or transferred as a punishment, though the head constable and constable were met by a patrol from Listowel Station that night returning from the post riding at full speed on the bicycles that had received sixteen and six punctures, respectively; whether, seeing that subsequently the fact was brought under the notice of the county inspector that the charge brought by the head constable against the two constables was false, he will say whether the county inspector took any steps to inform the two constables that he had been made aware of the fact that there could be sufficient evidence produced to establish beyond any doubt that they were falsely charged and wrongfully punished; and whether he took any steps to wipe out that punishment so wrongfully inflicted on the two constables, and to have the conduct of the head constable brought under the notice of the Inspector-General for having brought this malicious charge against two innocent men.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General informs me that Head

Constable Wilson reported that, when at Lisiniska protection post on 10th September, 1904, his bicycle tyres and those of a constable who accompanied him were punctured in a number of places. The head constable, however, made no suggestion as to the persons by whom the injuries were committed. The head constable and constable rode their bicycles to Listowel that night, but were not met by any patrol. Constables Coughlan and Kilcawley were reported for breaches of discipline and for irregular discharge of their duties, and for these offences they were transferred from the protection post. As no charge was made against the constables in connection with the injury to the bicycles the county inspector took no steps in the matter, and there were no grounds for reporting the conduct of the head constable.

Agrarian Outrages.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of agrarian outrages reported from the counties of Galway, Roscommon, Sligo, Leitrim, Tipperary, and King's County, respectively, in the three months ended 31st March and 30th June of 1906 and 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The following statement shows the numbers of agrarian offences for the quarters mentioned:—

	March Quarter, 1906.	March Quarter, 1907.
King's County - -	2	1
Galway, East Riding -	4	19
Galway, West Riding -	4	8
Leitrim - - -	—	5
Roscommon - - -	2	—
Sligo - - - -	2	2
Tipperary, North Riding	2	2
Tipperary, South Riding	1	1

	June Quarter, 1906.	June Quarter, 1907.
King's County - -	—	3
Galway, East Riding -	3	35
Galway, West Riding -	3	9
Leitrim - - -	2	2
Roscommon - - -	1	6
Sligo - - - -	2	3
Tipperary, North Riding	4	4
Tipperary, South Riding	—	1

Appointments of Clerks of Irish Unions.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many newly-elected clerks of union have been sanctioned by the Local Government Board during the past eight years and for what unions; how many of these persons were subjected to a written examination in arithmetic, book-keeping, composition, and orthography by the Local Government Board or by someone on behalf of the Board; and whether the present clerks of union for Schull, Macroom, Dunmanway, Millstreet, Fermoy, Midleton, Mallow, Castlecomer, Callan, Birr, Clonmel, and Athy were subjected to any written examination before their appointment was sanctioned by the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The following is a list of the unions in which newly-elected clerks have been appointed with the sanction of the Local Government Board between 1st April, 1899, and 31st March, 1907:—

Ballycastle.
Bawnboy.
Belfast.
Birr.
Boyle.
Cahirciveen.
Callan (two).
Castlebar.
Castleblayney.
Castlecomer.
Castlerea.
Celbridge.
Claremorris.
Coleraine.
Corrofin.
Delvin.
Dingle.
Downpatrick.
Drogheda.
Dromore, West.
Dublin, South.
Dunfanaghy (two).
Ennistymon.
Glenties.
Irvinestown.
Kenmare.
Kilkeel.
Kilmacthomas.
Kilrush.
Larne.
Limavady.
Longford.
Loughrea.
Lurgan.
Macroom.
Midleton.
Millstreet.
Mitchelstown.
Mohill.
Mount Bellew.
Mullingar.
Naas.
Navar.
Newtownards.
Oldcastle.
Rathdown.
Scariff.
Skull.
Sligo (two).
Strabane.
Strokestown.
Tobercurry.
Tralee.
Trim.
Tulla.
Tullamore.
Urlingford.

In twenty-five of these cases the persons appointed were required to undergo a written examination in all or some of the subjects mentioned in the Question, and in some of the remaining cases an oral examination was held. An examination is not required when the Board are satisfied as to the candidate's knowledge of the prescribed subjects by reason of previous experience in the Poor Law service or otherwise. In one of the unions named in the concluding portion of the Question, the person now holding the office of clerk was subjected to a written examination before sanction was given.

Evictions on Captain Boyce's Estate near Tallow.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that eviction proceedings are pending in reference to a farm held by Michael Cleary from Captain Boyce, near Tallow, county Waterford, at the yearly rent of £95; whether the eviction is in consequence of the tenant refusing to agree to the owner's terms as to purchase; whether the rent of this farm and of an adjoining farm are under a settlement applicable for the maintenance of the charity called the Tallow Almshouses; and whether he will call the attention of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests to the proposed eviction with a view to their obtaining the mediation of the Estates Commissioners, so as to enable the tenant to purchase his holding at a fair price and to prevent the loss of income to this charity.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests inform me that the farm in question is not chargeable with any charitable annuity, nor is the rent applicable to any such purpose. It has, however, been ascertained that no eviction proceedings against Michael Cleary are pending, but that proceedings for the recovery of rent have been taken. It is further understood that the landlord would not object to the mediation of the Estates Commissioners upon the question of the purchase by Cleary of his holding. If such mediation should be wished for, the parties to the case should themselves approach the Commissioners on the subject.

Irish Agricultural Department and Audit Fees.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the recent decision of Mr. Justice Barton in the case of the Local Government Board against the county Cork Agricultural and Technical Committee, declaring that the charges made by the Board for audit fees are not recoverable; whether such charges have been made in the case of the county Waterford and all other counties in Ireland; how much has been paid for audit fees to the Board by agricultural and technical committees since they came into existence; whether the Board will recoup them the amount of these illegal charges; and whether similar charges have been made against the asylum committees.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The official report of the judgment of Mr. Justice Wright (not Mr. Justice Barton) has been received, and is at present under the consideration of the Local Government Board with a view to appeal. The judgment does not apply to county Waterford or other counties similarly circumstanced. It would involve a prolonged search to ascertain the amount recovered for audit fees from Committees of Agricultural and Technical Instruction since they came into existence, and the information would be misleading, as the majority of them are not in reality affected by the decision, even if it be upheld on an appeal. Asylum committees are similarly assessed in respect of audit fees, but they are not affected by the decision, as their constitution rests upon a basis different from that of Committees of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. It is not the intention of the Local Government Board to recoup the fees paid for auditors' services already rendered.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Claim of Mrs. Delany.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have been mindful of the claim of Mrs. Delany, the representative of the late John Delany, who was evicted in 1889, by the late John George Adair, from his holding at Roskeen, Cappalough electoral division, Mountmellick Union, Queen's County, for non-payment of two years' rack rent; and can he say, in view of the fact that the planter has not purchased, whether Mrs. Delany is one of the evicted tenants whom the Commissioners propose reinstating in the evicted holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have noted Mrs. Delany's application for consideration in connection with the distribution of such untenanted land as they may acquire, but they have decided to take no action to secure her reinstatement in her late husband's former holding, which is occupied by another tenant.

Delay in Sale of Estate of Captain Caldbeck.

MR. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what is the cause of the delay in the completion of the sale on the estate of Captain Caldbeck, Ballacolla, Queen's County; whether he is aware that the estate has been before the Estates Commissioners for the past three years; and will he use his influence to have the sale expedited.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have made a provisional offer for the purchase of this estate, but the owner has not accepted it. The matter is now under the further consideration of the Commissioners.

Promotion of Irish School Teachers.

MR. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the practice, which existed up to April, 1906, of giving promotion to teachers immediately after the award of partial increments of salary has been discontinued; and, if so, whether he can state the reason for this change of policy.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that it has not been the practice at any time since the introduction of the new system of payments to promote teachers immediately after the award of a partial increment of salary. In some instances, however, in which the Commissioners considered that the award of a partial increment did not meet the equity of the case, teachers were advanced to the next higher grade. The necessity for this exceptional treatment has now ceased to exist.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Greenwich Generating Station.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can now state the result of the negotiations between the Admiralty and the London County Council with reference to the generating station at Greenwich, having regard to the fact that the Committee appointed to inquire into the matter reported on 17th December last.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W. for Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply for him. He regrets that he is not yet able to give the hon. Gentleman a definite reply. Negotiations are still in progress and have not yet reached a point at which any statement can be made.

MR. ASHLEY: I was asked to put down the Question for this day. When shall I repeat it?

CAPTAIN NORTON: This day week.

Cavalry Barracks for Scotland.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrew's Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to state how long it will be before he can make any announcement with regard to the building of cavalry barracks in Scotland, or how long it will take approximately to complete these barracks once they are begun.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): As I have already informed the House, the question of providing cavalry barracks in Scotland turns on great questions of cavalry policy which are now being worked out. I cannot, therefore, undertake to give the hon. and gallant Member any further information in regard to the points raised in his Question at the present time.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of my Question, as to the time of building?

MR. HALDANE: That depends on the size.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: A barracks for a cavalry regiment. What would be the cost?

MR. HALDANE: That depends on whether we get a site given.

New Cavalry Sword.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the new pattern cavalry sword is satisfactory; and, if so, when it will be issued.

MR. HALDANE: Three hundred swords of the new pattern are now under trial by cavalry regiments, and reports will be made in September.

New Bayonet.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now make any statement with regard to the selection and issue of the new pattern bayonet.

MR. HALDANE: No report on the samples sent for trial to India has yet been received. I am not, therefore, in a position to make any statement on the matter.

Transvaal Loan.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): On behalf of the hon. Member for Gravesend, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any portion, and, if so, how much, of the guarantee loan of £5,000,000 to the Transvaal is to be applied to the repatriation of the burghers and to compensation to burghers.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): It is understood that no part of the loan will be devoted to the purposes mentioned by the hon. Member.

Papers on the Transvaal Loan.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): On behalf of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when he proposes to lay the Papers respecting the negotiations for the Transvaal guaranteed loan between His Majesty's Government and the Transvaal Government.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is proposed to lay Papers in connection with the Transvaal loan about the beginning of next week.

Railways in Northern Nigeria.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: On behalf of the hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any Report, with regard to the problems of railway construction in Northern Nigeria, has yet been received from Sir Percy Girouard; and, if so, whether he can lay the Report upon the Table or make any statement on the subject.

MR. CHURCHILL: Sir Percy Girouard's Report has been received, and the question of laying it upon the Table will be considered. I have private notice of a similar question from the hon. Member for Clitheroe, and if the hon. Member has no objection I propose to make a short statement in reply to both at the conclusion of questions to-day.

Orange River Union.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Secretary of State has received a despatch from the Governor of the Orange River Colony, containing a Resolution passed at Bloemfontein on the 4th July by the Congress of the Orange River Union, to be laid before His Majesty; whether he can give the terms of the Resolution; and whether the Union is a body representative of a large majority of the British subjects of European race in the Orange River Colony.

MR. CHURCHILL: The despatch has been received. The terms of the two Resolutions which it contained are as follows:—"The Congress of the Orangia Union, having considered the provisions of the Constitution granted by His Majesty the King to this Colony, begs respectfully to express its thanks to His Majesty for the kindly message of good wishes accompanying the grant. It declares itself in full accord with the views expressed in Paragraph V. of the Report of the Central Committee that the liberal measure of responsible Government granted to this Colony will be warmly appreciated and gratefully received by the people; that the trust reposed by His Majesty the King in this community will prove to be fully justified and will greatly aid in the satisfactory solution of difficult problems, and tend to promote contentment amongst the people and the general welfare of the land. The Chairman is instructed to forward this Resolution to His Excellency the Governor with respectful request to bring the same to the notice of His Majesty the King." Resolution—"The Congress of the Orangia Union avails itself of this opportunity to tender its congratulations to His Excellency Sir Hamilton Goold Adams on his appointment as Governor of this Colony. It feels convinced that His Excellency's abilities and experience, coupled with his proved readiness to further the interests of this Colony, will greatly contribute to promote the welfare of this country and its people. The Congress further desires to assure His Excellency that the people of whom its members are the deputies will at all times be found ready and willing to co-operate heartily with him in all measures tending to advance the progress and prosperity of this Colony in particular and of South Africa. Unanimously resolved at Bloemfontein this 4th day of July, 1907." It is generally admitted that the Union represents the large majority of those of Dutch descent in the Orange River Colony.

MR. MACKARNESS asked whether the first Resolution was not proposed by ex-President Steyn and seconded by General De Wet.

MR. CHURCHILL: I cannot say, but probably it is so.

British-Indians in the Transvaal.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the situation in the Transvaal Colony arising out of the refusal of the British-Indian population to submit to registration under the Asiatic Law Amendment Act; and whether, in view of the assurances of both His Majesty's Government and General Botha, His Majesty's Government will make representations to the Government of the Transvaal, or take any steps to protect the British-Indian community from imprisonment and deportation.

MR. CHURCHILL: I can give no information to the House on this question beyond what is generally known. The position is one of unusual difficulty as my hon. friend is aware. His Majesty's Government will take no steps inconsistent with the self-governing Constitution of the Transvaal Colony. But constant inquiry will be made through the High Commissioner.

*SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the grievance complained of attaches not so much to the Ordinance as to the regulations made under it—especially to the degrading system of identification by ten finger-print impressions, usually applicable only to the registration of criminals in gaols?

MR. CHURCHILL said that everyone must regret the application of one particular test to one particular race, but the actual system of identification by finger-prints was a highly scientific system of identification, and he would certainly not be prepared to condemn it. As to the regulations being the cause of a great amount of feeling against the Ordinance, he thought that was perfectly true, but he was sure the Transvaal Government would make the regulations as little painful as possible to the Indian community, who were a very influential community.

Railway Extension in Nigeria.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has any announcement to make with regard to railways in Northern Nigeria?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir. It has been decided to authorise the immediate coustruction of a pioneer railway of 3 feet 6 inches gauge 400 miles long from Baro, which is the highest convenient point on the perennially navigable reaches of the Niger, to Bida, by Zungeru, and thence to Zaria and Kano. The work of construction, which will occupy four years, will be begun under the general supervision of Sir Percy Girouard, whose experience in building the desert railway in the Soudan is well known. Full estimates based on regular surveys place the cost of such a line at £3,000 a mile, or £1,230,000 in all. In view of the fact that the amalgamation of Northern and Southern Nigeria is approved in principle, and will probably be accomplished in the next few years, the money will be raised as a loan by Southern Nigeria, and will form part of the debt of that Colony. The rapidly expanding revenues of Southern Nigeria and its excellent financial position will in the opinion of the Secretary of State enable that Colony to assume this burden without embarrassment, and Sir Walter Egerton, the Governor of Southern Nigeria, fully concurs. But as an off-set the Chancellor of the Exchequer has agreed that the annual contribution of £70,000 now exacted from Southern Nigeria in aid of the finances of Northern Nigeria shall be reduced in any year by a sum equal to whatever interest charge may in respect of this loan be defrayed by Southern Nigeria, and, further, in order that the Colony may obtain its money on the most favourable terms the Treasury have consented that the loan should be made out of the Local Loans Fund in the same way as the loan to Jamaica on account of the earthquake is to be made. His Majesty's Government have been led to this decision by three distinct sets of considerations. First, the enormous administrative and military difficulties of continuing to hold so great an extent of territory as Northern Nigeria without any central line of rapid communication; secondly, the obvious financial disadvantages of paying a grant-in-aid of nearly £300,000 a year for a province whose commercial development is completely arrested for want of such communication; and, thirdly, the immense importance of enabling British enterprise to reach the extensive cotton growing areas of Northern Nigeria, and thus vary and multiply the sources of the supply of so vital a raw material. I should add that the intention to construct the Baro-Kano railway will in no way be allowed to arrest or delay the progress of the Lagos railway, which will be steadily continued till it crosses the Niger at Jebba and ultimately effects a junction with the northern line at or in the neighbourhood of Zungeru. It would not be possible to enter upon argument in answer to a Question, but Papers will be shortly laid before both Houses containing the fullest information both as regards policy and method.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) asked whether, in view of the suggested amalgamation of Northern and Southern Nigeria, the Government would keep a watchful eye on the drink traffic in that part of Africa, and prevent its making further strides in that direction.

MR. CHURCHILL replied that Lord Elgin was thoroughly alive to the importance of the question.

Brussels Sugar Convention.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state the nature of the guarantees against damage to producing States which are required in connection with the additional Act of the Brussels Sugar Conference relieving Great Britain of the necessity of imposing a penalty upon bounty-fed sugar.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): My right hon. friend is unable to make any statement at present beyond what he told the House on the 1st instant.†

The Unrest in Morocco.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps are being taken to protect the lives and property of British subjects in the coast towns of Morocco.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The outbreak at Dar-el-Baida was not directed against any British subjects. His Majesty's Government are informed that the French Government is sending a force to that place which is sufficient to give security. There does not appear to be need for further measures.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxix., 1305 *et seq.*

MR. ASHLEY: Are we to understand that the protection of the lives and property of British subjects is to be left to the ships and troops of foreign nations?

MR. RUNCIMAN: No, Sir. We shall take such steps as are necessary.

MR. ASHLEY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that there is serious unrest in Mogador and other coast towns?

[The reply was inaudible.]

Charge against Clerkenwell Police.

MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of John Thomas Barlow, who was sentenced by Mr. Bros at the Clerkenwell Police Court on 29th July to one month's imprisonment on a charge of assaulting Police Constable Morgan; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the facts of the case, particularly with regard to the prisoner's statement that he was assaulted and given a black eye by a police officer in the cells at the police station between the time of his being charged there and his being bailed out shortly after, and the prisoner's further statement that the officer assaulting him was remonstrated with by another officer for this act of violence.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): My attention had not previously been called to this case, but I find on inquiry that the prisoner's allegation that he was assaulted by a police officer in the police station was made to the magistrate who tried the case, and was investigated by him, and that he found it was not substantiated. No further investigation appears to me to be necessary.

Passive Resisters.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what number of persons have been prosecuted as passive resisters for non-payment of rates in this year; and what has been the number in the years 1904, 1905, and 1906.

MR. GLADSTONE: As I have several times explained in answer to Questions in this House, it is impossible to give the information asked for, because there is no legal distinction between a "passive resister" and an ordinary rate defaulter.

Gateshead Motor Driving Prosecutions.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to a decision of the magistrates at Gateshead with reference to furious motor driving or driving to the public danger; and if he will, with reference to future legislation, take the case into consideration with the view of trying motor-driving charges before similar tribunals, as in Scotland.

MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my hon. friend. I have made inquiry into this case. The police took the number of the car before it disappeared, and the owner, on being applied to, furnished as required by statute the name of the driver. When the case was heard the accused pleaded not guilty, and as there was no one present who could identify the driver the case was dismissed. It appears to me that the justices should in the circumstances have granted a remand, when the owner could have been called to give evidence, and I shall so inform them. I do not, however, see any need to alter the procedure by which charges under the Motor Acts are dealt with by the ordinary Courts in England.

Scrabster and Scape Mail Boat.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if application has been made to him to permit the mail boat conveying mails from Scrabster to Scapa, and *vice versa*, to land passengers at Aith Hope or elsewhere; and if, in view of the inconvenience that has followed the granting of this privilege in the past, he will adhere to the promise of his predecessor, Lord Stanley.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): My right hon. friend has received a request that the Orkney mail steamer should be allowed to call occasionally at Aith Hope to land passengers; but, in view of the delay which such calls would entail, he has decided not to alter the existing arrangement under which the steamer is allowed to call for passenger purposes at Switha—but not at Aith Hope—under the conditions described in the letter which Lord Stanley addressed to the hon. Member on the 9th June, 1904.

Wick and Thurso Mails.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state whether the Highland Railway Company is liable to any penalty for delay in delivering mails at Wick and Thurso at the appointed time; if so, if he will warn the company that the penalties will be duly enforced; and, if there is no enforceable penalty, if he will ascertain on what terms the railway company would convey the mails with punctuality during the months of August and September.

CAPTAIN NORTON (for Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON): There is no penalty expressly provided in the mail contract with the Highland Railway Company for loss of time in running the mail trains to Wick and Thurso; but my right hon. friend believes that they make every effort to ensure the punctual performance of the service. As the hon. Member has already been informed, the company have great difficulty in maintaining punctuality on a railway with a single line of rails during the tourist season when the traffic is abnormally heavy, and it can hardly be expected that they could give a guarantee of absolute punctuality during August and September. My right hon. friend adds that the departure of the mail train from Perth is frequently delayed by the late arrival there of the connecting trains from the South, over most of which he has no control. He can assure the hon. Member that a careful watch is kept in his Department on the working of the mail trains, and that the attention of the company is always called to any unsatisfactory working.

Merionethshire Teachers' Salaries.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state the substance of any communication that he has sent to the Merioneth local education authority on the subject of the date of payment of the salaries of teachers; whether he has received any reply; and, if so, what is the substance of such reply.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The substance of my communication to the local education authority consisted of a request to them to pay the salaries of the teachers in the voluntary schools as soon as possible. I have not as yet received a reply, and I do not suppose the authority have had time to convene a meeting to consider my letter.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had also communicated with the West Riding education authority in regard to the Low Valley School.

MR. MCKENNA said he had communicated with the West Riding education authority, and he hoped the question would be ended satisfactorily.

LORD R. CECIL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the local education authority for Merioneth is not assembled at the present moment?

MR. MCKENNA: I was not aware of that fact, but I have no doubt a special meeting will be called.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is exercising, or proposes to exercise, his powers under The Defaulting Authorities Act, 1904, to secure that the teachers in the voluntary schools of Merioneth are not deprived of the enjoyment of their holidays by the withholding of the salaries which they have earned until the expiration of the holidays, or whether the council of Merioneth can offer any explanation of the distinction which they make in time of payment between the teachers in council and in voluntary schools.

MR. MCKENNA: So far as I am aware no question of the exercise of my powers under the Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904, can be considered, as the conditions precedent for the exercise of such powers do not appear to have been satisfied.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware that it is the duty of the local education authority to maintain the schools within its area and to maintain all schools alike, and that if the local authority declines to do this, either by making direct payments or otherwise, with regard to one class of teachers, that creates a case of hardship which the Defaulting Authorities Act was passed to avoid?

MR. MCKENNA: The Defaulting Authorities Act requires as a condition of being enforced that the managers should have paid the salaries themselves, and should have appeared to have paid those salaries to keep the schools efficient. In the present case the managers have not paid the salaries, and therefore, there is no ground on which the Defaulting Authorities Act can be enforced.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that by informing the local authority of the intentions of the Board when the right thing is not being done he may get the right thing done more promptly than if he waits for the action of the managers in paying out of their own pockets money which ought to be provided by the local authorities?

MR. MCKENNA: I am not sure that I apprehend the course the hon. Gentleman wishes me to take.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: I should like the right hon. Gentleman to communicate with the local authority to say that, if they were not treating this class of teachers fairly, the Defaulting Authorities Act would be put into operation.

MR. MCKENNA: I could make no such communication to the local authority. It would be contrary to the law if I were to attempt to put the Act into force when the necessary conditions have not arisen.

LORD R. CECIL: Will the right hon. Gentleman say that if the managers do pay the salaries he will repay them the cost to which they have been put? Has it not been the usual practice of the Education Department in reference to this Act?

MR. MCKENNA: The Answer is no to both Questions.

LORD R. CECIL: Is the right hon. Gentleman not prepared to put in force the Defaulting Authorities Act under any circumstances?

MR. MCKENNA: I shall be prepared to state what I will do when the necessary conditions have arisen.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with the managers as well as the local authority to ascertain whether this case of hardship has arisen?

MR. MCKENNA: I understand hardship has not arisen. I am informed the salaries have been paid by another party.

LORD R. CECIL: Does the right hon. Gentleman refer to the National Union of Teachers? If so, does payment by them apply to anybody except those teachers who are members of that society?

MR. MCKENNA: I am informed the teachers have been paid.

LORD R. CECIL: By whom?

MR. MCKENNA: By the National Union of Teachers.

Capital Outlay on Church of England Training Colleges.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can indicate the approximate sum which has been expended on capital outlay upon training colleges of the Church of England since the 1st of August, 1895.

MR. MCKENNA: I regret the Board have no complete information on the subject.

Ardglass Harbour.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, as Ardglass, county Down, is a Royal harbour, he will cause inquiries to be made during the recess as to the cost of removing the Churn Rock in that harbour, in view of the fact that it prevents the development of the harbour, is injurious to the fishing industry, and has been the cause of several boat wrecks and loss of life.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am not sure how far this work is required, but I will as the hon. Member suggests make inquiry.

Import Jerquing Clerks.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what are the present number, grades, and salaries of the clerks set apart from the Long Room staff for the work of import jerquing in London; what was the cost of this staff for each of the last five financial years; how many queries were issued; and what additional duty was brought to the revenue as a result of the errors discovered.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have already explained to the hon. Member that I am unable to give the information he asks for in the first two parts of the Question. The total number of jerquers' queries on all subjects issued in each of the last five years and the amount of duty brought to account as a result of errors discovered were, I learn, as follows:—

		£	s.	d.
1902–3	3,138	18	7	11
1903–4	2,468	13	1	3
1904–5	2,793	10	10	11
1905–6	2,846	6	7	6
1906–7	2,359	4	11	1

It should be observed that the business of the jerquer is to check accounts, and that the importance of the duties is not to be measured by the amount of additional revenue brought to account by means of his inspection.

Customs Upper Section Clerks.

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many vacancies in the position of upper section clerk in the Customs have arisen during the past twelve months; how many have been filled up; and, with regard to any existing vacancies, when the junior officers will be promoted to fill them.

MR. RUNCIMAN: During the year ended 31st ult., eight vacancies occurred in the ranks of clerk, second class, upper section. One of the places vacated was abolished in consequence of the repeal of the coal duty. None of the remaining places have been filled, and the Board of Customs do not consider that it would be in the interests of the public service to indicate in advance their intentions in relation to questions involving the promotion of officers.

Customs Surveyorships Promotions.

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, by the terms of Treasury Minute, 24th March, 1891, the Surveyors General in the Customs Department were constituted a standing committee to be directly consulted by the Board in dealing with promotions to surveyorships and promotions within the grade of that rank; who are the officials now responsible for this duty; and whether the sanction of the Treasury was obtained for the alteration.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Board of Customs inform me that they have never failed to consult the Surveyors General with regard to the promotions mentioned in the Question.

Customs Collectors.

MR. C. DUNCAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what number of appointments have been made to the position of collector since 1st January, 1905, and how many of this number were appointed from the London staff; what is the age and length of service of the officer recently appointed to this rank; whether he failed to qualify in the test laid down by the Board for the position of first-class examining officer in 1905; what special qualifications he has displayed since that date to warrant his promotion over the heads of many of his seniors; and what immediate increase of salary did he derive from the promotion.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am informed that since 1st January, 1905, fifteen appointments from the general body of eligible officers serving at all ports have been made to the position of collector. Five of the fifteen officers were serving in London at the time of appointment. The age of the officer last appointed is forty-three years, and his length of service is twenty-one years. Early in 1905 this officer was specially selected to fill a position of chief officer, and it is true that he subsequently failed to pass the test referred to in the Question. He, however, attended an examination for examining officer, first class, in April last, at which he took a very high place, and the Board, having regard to this result and to the satisfactory manner in which he conducted the business of his port, as well as his general fitness for advancement, have selected him for the important position of collector. The immediate increase of salary obtained was £77 13s.

Valuation of Sheep Stocks in Scotland.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Law Officers have yet given an opinion on the valuation of sheep stocks in Scotland under the Agricultural Act, 1906; and, if so, will the Government make known the result.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): I cannot add anything at present to the Answer which I gave my hon. friend on this matter on the 25th ult.†

Ailsa Craig Rating Valuation.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland why the Northern Lights Commissioners' property on Ailsa Craig is valued for rating at £100 a year; whether any rates or taxes have been paid in respect of it; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in the matter, in view of the exemption of such property from rates and taxes by Section 731 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The valuation is made by the local assessor, and the Commissioners have no information as to why it is fixed at £100. The Northern Lighthouse Commissioners' property is exempted from rates, etc., and none have been paid in respect of their property on Ailsa Craig. Under these circumstances I do not propose to take any steps.

Whale Killing off Shetland.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if the Scottish Fishery Board has forwarded any recommendations with regard to the whale killing in Shetland and its effect on the great herring fishery; and whether any members of the Scottish Fishery Board are shareholders, directors, or promoters of whale-killing companies.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Fishery Board have expressed their concurrence in the findings of the Committee who publicly investigated and reported upon the subject of whale fishing in Shetland and upon whose recommendations the Whale Fishing Bill is founded. My information is that no member of the Fishery Board is a director or promoter of a whale-killing company. The question of shareholding is not one into which I consider it advisable to inquire.

LORD R. CECIL: Did the Fishery Board Report that the existing practice is or is not beneficial?

MR. SINCLAIR: The noble Lord will find full information in the Report.

Deportation of Paupers from Scotland to Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland what action he proposes to take with regard to the intended deportation of Edward Farrell from Craiglockhart Workhouse to Newry Workhouse; and whether, having regard to the fact that Scotland has had the benefit of his labour and expenditure from youth to old age, he will represent to the Local Government Board for Scotland the hardship upon the ratepayers of Newry Union of making this old man chargeable on them in the few years that are left to him.

MR. SINCLAIR: Under the Poor Law (Scotland) Act, 1898, which provides for an appeal being made to the Local Government Board for Scotland against the removal of a pauper to England or Ireland, no appeal is competent where the pauper has not resided continuously for a year in the parish proposing to remove him. In the case referred to by the hon. Member, I am informed that the pauper has never resided in Edinburgh continuously for more than four or five months, and accordingly the Board have no power to entertain the appeal against his removal made to them by the Newry Union Board of Guardians.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxix., 145–6.

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Bill.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will arrange to take the Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill on an early date.

MR. SINCLAIR: Yes, Sir.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Is it intended to go further with it?

MR. SINCLAIR: Certainly, Sir, on the earliest possible opportunity.

Shetland Herring Fishery.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if, in view of the fact that, owing to the destruction of whales, the herring fishing for sailing boats has practically been ruined on the West Coast of Shetland, and that now the North and East are threatened, he will take power to stop further killing should he find such a drastic step necessary.

MR. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend is aware of the policy of the Government in this matter, which is dealt with in the Bill now before the House.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) asked if it was the view of the Government that the ruin of this fishing was due to the killing of whales?

MR. SINCLAIR: I think the hon. Gentleman was present at the debate in which I expressed the views of the Government at greater length than is possible by means of Question and Answer across the floor of the House.

Kilneel Rural Council and the Labourers Acts.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board has been called to the fact that the Kilkeel Rural Council, county Down, receive only an annual quota per cottage, under the Labourers Acts, and nothing towards annuity or loan, the second scheme promoted by the council being too late to participate in a share of the arrear in March, 1906, and too early to get its 36 per cent. under the new Act; and whether, having regard to the fact that the Kilkeel scheme cost less per cottage than the schemes of any other council in county Down, and that other councils in the county have had their whole loans cleared, the Local Government Board can arrange for a payment to the Kilkeel Council from the accumulated arrears lying to the credit of the county.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange; for Mr. BIRRELL): On the occasion of the distribution of the Exchequer Grant in March, 1906, the Kilkeel Rural District Council received £352 7s. 5d. Of this amount £22 went to recoup the expenditure which fell directly on the rates during the year in respect of labourers cottages, and the balance was paid to the Commissioners of Public Works in reduction of the capital liability of the district council in respect of loans for cottages. The Exchequer contribution for the financial year ended in March, 1907, has been distributed in accordance with Section 18 of the Act of last session, namely, in proportion to the number of cottages built on the 1st November, 1906, in each rural district in which loans are outstanding. There is, however, an accumulated reserve of £3,264 to the credit of the county of Down which is not subject to this method of distribution, as it accrued before the commencement of the new Act. The question of the distribution of this balance will shortly be considered, and due regard will be had to all the circumstances of the various rural districts in the county. The statements made in the concluding portion of the Question appear to be correct.

MR. MOORE: Will a similar course be taken in regard to cottages in county Antrim?

MR. CHERRY: I should think the same rules would apply to each county.

Inspectors of Irish National Schools.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that during the past few years various inspectors of national schools in Ireland have had their annual increments of salary refused or postponed; whether he is aware that these refusals and postponements have taken place even in the case of men whose work and conduct are above reproach, and that this was done by the higher officials to whom the Commissioners leave all such matters; and whether, in view of the discontent amongst the general body of inspectors, because of the treatment to which they are being subjected in this and other respects and the consequent injury to education, he will appoint a small Committee to inquire into the working of the National Education Office or into some of the cases of injustice of which it is guilty.

MR. CHERRY: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that during the past few years they have refused or postponed the award of increments to inspectors in five cases, but it is not the fact that the work and conduct of these inspectors were above reproach or that the Commissioners leave the decision in such cases to the higher officials. As regards the remainder of the Question, I can only refer to the Answer which my right hon. friend gave to a precisely similar Question put by the hon. Member for West Kerry on 22nd April last.†

Irish Grazing Dispute.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the suggestion of Mr. Justice Ross in the Land Judge's Court on 29th July that, in cases where intimidation was being used against graziers and the owners of grazing lands, the Estates Commissioners should refuse to advance public money to purchase these lands; and whether, seeing that the measures taken by the executive to suppress this form of intimidation have failed, he will consider the desirability of instructing the Estates Commissioners in accordance with the suggestion of Mr. Justice Ross.

MR. CHERRY: I have seen a newspaper report of the learned Judge's remarks to the effect mentioned in the Question. In Answer to the concluding part of the Question, my right hon. friend desires me to refer to the full reply which he gave on 14th May to the Question put by the hon. Member for the Oswestry Division.†

MR. MOORE: Is a pronouncement like this by a Judge of the High Court to have no effect on the opinion of the Chief Secretary?

MR. CHERRY: The Chief Secretary formed his opinion before the pronouncement by the Judge. The Government decided not to refuse to allow the landlord in these cases the right to sell to the Commissioners, but in cases where intimidation has been exercised by individuals steps will be taken to prevent them getting the land.

Mr. Orpon's Brewsterfield (Kerry) Estate.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the estate of the late R. H. Orpon at Brewsterfield, county Kerry, is still under the Land Judge's Court; if not, has there been an agreement made for the sale to the Estates Commissioners; and will he direct the attention of the Estates Commissioners to the prices sought to be secured from Thomas Brosnan and some of the other tenants who were never allowed to have fair rents fixed.

MR. CHERRY: The Registrar of the Land Judge's Court informs me that the proceedings in that Court for the sale of the estate in question have been stayed in order that, if possible, a sale may be carried out through the Estates Commissioners. All the tenants except one have now signed agreements to purchase in the event of a sale to the Estates Commissioners. The matter has not yet come before the Commissioners, but if they should decide to acquire the property, they will have full opportunity of inquiring as to the terms upon which the tenants have agreed to purchase.

Irish Agrarian Offences Returns.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the offence of cattle driving is included in the official Returns of agrarian outrages; and, if so, under what heading of these Returns the offence is classified.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1372.

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 799.

MR. CHERRY: Separate official Returns of agrarian outrages are not published, but the offence of cattle driving is included in the ordinary criminal statistics under the heading of unlawful assembly.

*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Will the threatening letter recently written by the hon. Member for North Armagh to Mr. Commissioner Bailey be included in the Return of outrages issued quarterly, and will the police report this outrage to the going Judge of Assize in Dublin as is usually done in the case of other threatening letters in order that the Judge may make a political speech from the Bench on the criminal state of Ireland?

MR. CHERRY: I do not think the Commissioner sent it to the police, so it would not be included.

Agrarian Crime Trials.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of prisoners for trial at the recent summer assizes in Ireland for offences recorded as agrarian; and what were the results of the trials in such cases.

MR. CHERRY: The number of persons returned for trial at the recent summer assizes, for offences recorded as agrarian, was 167, the number of distinct cases being twenty-three. Three persons were convicted; thirty-one were acquitted; in the case of twenty-three persons the jury disagreed; and as regards the remaining 110 persons the cases were postponed to the next assizes.

Irish Police.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the strain upon the resources of the existing police establishment caused by the employment over lengthened periods of additional forces of police in several counties of Ireland, and the consequent depletion of the reserve force at the depot in Dublin and of a number of stations throughout the country, he is now in a position to hold out any hope that the Government will afford relief by a substantial increase of the establishment.

MR. CHERRY: The hon. Member may rest assured that the Government will take any steps which may become necessary for increasing the constabulary. As regards the suggestion that the reserve force at the depot has been depleted, I would remind the hon. Member that the very object with which that force was established was that it should be employed as occasion may require in aid of the ordinary constabulary force throughout the country. But in any case it is not the fact that the reserve force at the depot has been depleted, for a substantial portion of the force is still available at the depot.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is not public opinion in Ireland in favour of a large reduction of the force?

[No Answer was returned.]

Galway Assizes—Crime Returns.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the number of cases of serious crime included in the Returns presented by county inspectors of constabulary to the judges at the recent assizes for Galway, Leitrim, Sligo, and Roscommon under the following heads, viz., the number of cases since the last spring assizes, and the number of cases in the corresponding period of 1906.

MR. CHERRY: The figures for the two periods indicated are as follows, the figures for 1906 being stated first in each case;—Galway, E.R., twenty-six and sixty-three; Galway, W.R., thirteen and thirty-two; Leitrim, twelve and twelve; Roscommon thirteen and sixteen; Sligo, twenty and fourteen.

Kingston College, Mitchelstown.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will direct the attention of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests to the manner in which the charitable trust known as Kingston College, Mitchelstown, is administered; whether he is aware that this trust was created by James, Baron Kingston, for tenants on the estate who might become reduced in circumstances, but that only two such persons are at present deriving any advantage from the trust, while other persons have been imported from all quarters and enjoy the benefits of the trust, to the exclusion of tenants on the estate; and whether he will consider the advisability of a full inquiry and investigation into all the conditions of the trust and of the preparation of a scheme for the removal of impediments standing in the way of Catholic tenants on the estate having an equal claim with Protestant tenants to all the benefits of the trust.

MR. CHERRY: The trust known as Kingston College is not quite correctly described in the Question. This trust was created nearly a century and a-half ago by the then Lord Kingston, whose will provided for the establishment of houses or colleges for poor decayed gentlemen and gentlewomen, members of the Church of Ireland as by law established, with preference to such persons as have been tenants upon his estate. The trustees are certain Bishops of the Church of Ireland for the time being. So long as the trust is capable of being administered, and is administered, in accordance with the conditions of the trust, the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests have no power to intervene in the matter. In case, however, of a breach of trust, or if it should be shown that the trust could be no longer carried out according to the intention of the founder, the Commissioners have power to institute proceedings in the High Court. The facts stated in the Question do not appear to suggest that there has been any breach of trust, or that full effect cannot be given to the terms of the trust. If, however, any allegation to the contrary should be made, the Commissioners would doubtless give full consideration to the matter.

District Inspector Cruise, R.I.C.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the constabulary authorities has been directed to complaints concerning the conduct of District Inspector Cruise, Charleville, county Cork, at petty sessions courts and in the discharge of other official duties; are they aware that at the last petty sessions court this officer endeavoured to usurp the magisterial functions, suggested whipping as a proper punishment for a young lad accused of larceny, and stated he would take the skin off the lad's back; that in subsequent cases he continually interrupted the magistrates and solicitors by interposing his views, and was reprimanded by Captain Fitzpatrick, R.M.; and whether the constabulary authorities will require this officer to confine himself to his strictly official duties in future.

MR. CHERRY: The constabulary authorities inform me that District Inspector Cruise was the complainant in the case to which the Question particularly refers. It was the chairman of the bench and not Mr. Cruise who first suggested that the boy should be birched rather than sent to gaol, and the solicitor for the defence subsequently repeated the suggestion, which was eventually adopted by the Bench. I am informed that it is not the case that the district inspector said he would take the skin off the lad's back. I am also informed that it is not the fact that in subsequent cases the district inspector continually interrupted the magistrates and solicitors. He did, however, interrupt a solicitor for the defence by interposing the objection that the solicitor was putting leading questions. It is the case that the resident magistrate once rebuked Mr. Cruise. The Inspector-General informs me that Mr. Cruise is an active and efficient officer and that he is satisfied that the officer confines himself to the discharge of his official duties. In any case, so far as proceedings in Court are concerned, the magistrates appear to be well able to maintain the authority of the Court.

MR. FLYNN: Cannot this very efficient officer be sent to Belfast?

MR. CHERRY: The point is one well worth considering.

Police and Public Meetings in Cavan.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that an armed force of police, with District Inspectors Sharpe, Vanston, and Davis, and Mr. Sullivan, R.M., attended at Lismacanigan, county Cavan, on 28th July, where a public meeting in support of the reinstatement of the evicted tenants was announced to be held; that the officers in charge of the police stated that they had instructions to prevent the holding of the said meeting; that, after allowing the proceedings to be opened, the police got orders to fix bayonets, but subsequently the bayonets were sheathed, and a baton charge ordered and carried out; that as a result of this action a district councillor named Peter Smith received a serious injury; will he say who was responsible for the appearance of this armed force in a peaceable district, and what instructions were issued to the resident magistrate and police officers on the occasion; is he aware that, on the same day, the police took possession of a platform erected on the land of Mr. Nicholas Sheridan, Omard, who had given permission to the promoters for the holding of a meeting on his property, the meeting being called for the purpose of advising the tenants on the Dungimmon estate on the question of purchasing their holdings under the Land Purchase Act of 1903.

MR. CHERRY: Meetings were announced to be held on 28th July upon two evicted farms at Lismacanican and Dungimmon, the object of the meetings being to compel the present tenants to surrender the farms. As the object of the meetings was clearly intimidatory and unlawful, the Government directed that no meetings should be permitted on or near the evicted farms, and the promoters were warned accordingly. A force of sixty police under District Inspector Sharpe was assembled to carry out the orders of the Government. Mr. Sullivan, R.M., was merely present as a spectator. Twelve of the police were fully armed, and the remainder carried truncheons only. Forty of the police attended at Lismacanican, where a platform had been erected within forty yards of the evicted farm. About 1,500 persons, with bands and banners, came to the place, and despite the warnings previously given and repeated on the spot, an attempt was made to hold a meeting. The district inspector repeatedly called upon the crowd to disperse, and as they persistently refused to do so he ordered the police to disperse the crowd with truncheons, and this was done, no more force being used than was necessary. No injuries were reported except that Mr. Smith is said to have received a slight injury to the hand. A meeting was subsequently held at some distance from the evicted farm. In the case of Dungimmon, a platform had also been erected near the evicted farm and the new tenant's residence. In that case, however, the police eventually succeeded in persuading the leaders to hold a meeting elsewhere, and consequently no collision occurred.

MR. FLYNN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say why the police in Cavan are armed with deadly weapons while those in Belfast have only truncheons?

MR. CHERRY: Only a small number are so armed. In Belfast the services of the military have been secured.

MR. MOORE: Are the tenants of these two farms to be transplanted under the Evicted Tenants Bill as being dangerous to the peace of the neighbourhood?

MR. CHERRY: That is a hypothetical Question I cannot answer. The Bill has not yet become law.

MR. MOORE: Have the dispossessed holders of these farms been included in the 2,000 cases dealt with by the Bill?

MR. CHERRY: I cannot answer that without notice.

Mr. Reddy, M.P., and the Irish Lord Chancellor.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) asked the Attorney-General for Ireland whether it was a fact that the hon. Member for the Birr Division of King's County, Ireland, had been removed from the Commission of the Peace in consequence of a speech recently made by him, and whether this action had been taken by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland without calling on the hon. Member for any explanation of his speech, and whether it was not a fact that the hon. Member had since entirely denied the accuracy of the published report of the speech.

MR. CHERRY: I am afraid that I can give no information on the matter at present. I have seen a rumour in the papers this morning, but am not aware that any action has been taken by the Lord Chancellor.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is it not usual in these cases for the Lord Chancellor to ask an explanation before taking definite action?

MR. CHERRY: I think it is usual, but whether it was done on this occasion I do not know.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: My information is that it was not.

Small Schools in Ireland.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware of the fact that the population in Ireland is preponderatingly rural and that consequently a greater need for small schools exists than is the case in England, where the population is largely urban; and, if so, or in any event, will he carefully inquire into the point and consider the expressed views of the Chief Secretary upon it before he decides on the proposals to be made next year as to primary education in Ireland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): Yes, Sir. I am aware of the facts stated, and I can assure the hon. Member that I shall not take any decision in the matter without full consultation with my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary.

Labourers Acts Loans and Loan Capital Duty.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Wexford District Council expressing an opinion that it is unjust to charge loan capital duty on loans borrowed from the Government for the purpose of carrying out the Labourers Acts, and that Parliament intended to exclude from stamp duty all documents executed under these Acts; and, if so, will he take steps to have such duty remitted in future.

MR. ASQUITH: Loan capital duty is chargeable in respect of loans raised by local authorities generally, without regard to the particular purposes to which the loans may be applied; and I am not aware of any intention, either expressed or implied, on the part of Parliament to relieve Irish local authorities from this duty in respect of loans raised for the purposes of the Labourers Acts. I may, however, refer the hon. Member to a reply I gave to a Question by the hon. Member for Dublin County on 8th July last† from which he will see that the inconveniences which are alleged to arise from the application of the duty to those and to analogous cases are receiving consideration.

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked if the right hon. Gentleman intended to carry out in the Loan Funds Bill his promise to introduce legislation lightening the burden?

MR. ASQUITH replied that the matter would be dealt with in that Bill which would be introduced in a few days.

Irish Mail Service Subsidy.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that on the Civil Service Estimates for this year, Class VII., Vote 2, under Sub-head H, there appears a Vote of £6,500 for Irish passenger train service; if this sum has been annually paid to the London and North Western Railway since 1899 for an acceleration of the train known as the Irish mail; if he is aware that this train takes five hours and thirty-five minutes on the day journey to Holyhead, and five hours and thirty-two minutes on the night journey, and that since this subsidy was granted the railway company have run and are running a train in competition with the London and Kingstown route, known as the London and North Western boat train, which does the journey to Holyhead in thirteen minutes less on the day journey and seventeen minutes less on the night journey than the so-called accelerated passenger train; and whether, in view of these facts, it is proposed to continue this annual payment for a train service slower than that supplied by the railway company without subsidy.

MR. RUNCIMAN: For an explanation of this payment I beg to refer the hon. Member to the reply given on 26th July last year by my predecessor to the hon. Member for West Cavan;† and I may add that the payment has no reference to night mails. The accelerated day service still continues; and I see no reason at present for discontinuing the payment.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvii., 1175.

Mr. MOONEY asked whether it was not the fact that this payment was for a so-called accelerated service, and that the ordinary train run by the company was a faster train.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said he believed that statement was correct, but the undertaking given by the London and North-Western Company was that the train should run at a certain speed, and that undertaking had been fulfilled up to the present.

Mr. MOONEY asked whether it was not the fact that the Treasury were now paying £6,500 a year to the company for a train which was slower than the company's ordinary train.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said the payment was made in respect of an additional service, and he did not think the hon. Member would wish the company to withdraw that additional service.

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) asked whether the public service would suffer in the slightest degree if this payment were withdrawn.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: It is not only a question of the public service. It is a question of convenience to the traffic of Ireland.

Mr. MOONEY: Is it not the fact that since the subsidy was granted the company have on their own initiative started a train at a later hour which does the journey more quickly?

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that though this money was given to facilitate Irish traffic the way in which that is done is by packing this mail train with people who are booked to intermediate stations on this side only? The Company run a faster train than that, and will he interfere to stop this mail train from being overloaded with people who are not going to Ireland at all.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I am sure the hon. Gentleman would not like the service to cease. It is a delicate matter of negotiation and we cannot have a triangular discussion across the floor of the House.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: In view of the fact that it is almost impossible to obtain from the Treasury any subsidy, no matter how small, for Irish industries, for piers or harbours, or anything, will the Treasury see that this money granted for a faster service is not continued now when the ordinary trains run at a faster rate?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I cannot admit the hypothesis of the hon. Gentleman.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: It is absolutely true.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: If he will communicate with me privately I will consider, but I do not think it can be done now.

Mr. REDMOND: It is throwing away £6,000 a year.

Attack on Leitrim Postman.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether several, and, if so, how many, letters were taken from a postman on the 24th July last near Mullaghboy, county Leitrim, by six men with blackened faces; did any of the letters contain writs, and, if so, do the authorities connect the outrage with that fact; can he explain if any leakage of information occurred from the post office from which the attempted delivery was made; have any arrests been effected in the case; and will he consider the necessity of sending a police escort with postmen on their rounds in such disturbed districts.

Captain NORTON (for Mr. Sydney Buxton): It is reported to me that on the 23rd ultimo the postman from Carrigallen S.O. to Mullaghboy was attacked by three men disguised as women, who took from him five letters supposed to contain writs. I am having further inquiry made into the circumstances of this case, and am considering the best way of dealing with them in future.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxi., 1474.

The Companies Bill.

SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when the Second Reading of the Companies Bill will be taken.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): No, Sir, I cannot yet say.

Public Accounts Committee's Report.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will arrange to give a day for the consideration of the Public Accounts Committee Report.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My hon. friend is apparently unaware that I have answered this question two or three times already. It will be at the very end of the session.

LORD R. CECIL: When will the session end?

[No Answer was returned.]

Anticipatory Motions.

MR. BOWLES: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now give the House any information as to the steps which he has taken to secure the adoption of the recommendations of the Select Committee on Procedure (Anticipatory Motions).

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am sorry to say that on inquiry I find that a new Standing Order could not be adopted without considerable discussion. It is therefore impossible to proceed with the matter during the present session. The hon. Member will remember that my promise in relation to the Question was given on the condition that it would be possible to pass a new Standing Order with the assent of all parts of the House.

Irish Evicted Tenants Bill Finance.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if, seeing that the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill will entail the raising of ultimately about £2,000,000 for the purposes of the Bill, he will state how it is proposed that that sum shall be raised; and whether, having regard to the difficulty in obtaining money now, he will abandon the Bill for the present session.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The money will be raised as part of the amount required from time to time for land purchase under the Irish Land Act.

Government and the Fall in Securities.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been called to the continued fall in the price of Consols and other Government securities; and, in view of the difficulty which is experienced in raising further money at the present time, whether he will postpone all Bills which entail the finding of large sums of money, in the same way as the issue of the Transvaal loan has been postponed, until next year.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know to which Bills the hon. Member refers. But all the proposals put before the House by the Government have been framed with due regard to all the financial considerations involved.

The Condition of the Shetlanders.

*MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that the King of Norway has a moral and legal claim on the Shetland Isles, and that the people of the islands are menaced with starvation owing to the failure of the herring fishing, said to be caused by the destruction of whales, that for several years past His Majesty's Government have been unable to assist them, and that the herring are found further and further from the land as the whales are slaughtered, he will consider if the material well-being of the Shetlanders would be better under Norwegian than British rule.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I hardly imagine that this Question can be seriously intended.

*MR. CATHCART WASON: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that it is seriously intended. I should like further to ask the right hon. Gentleman if it is not the case that if the spirit of the people had not been ground between the upper and the nether millstones of Scottish Land Laws and Scottish tyranny they would have protected themselves as the Norwegians did?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice must be given of that Question.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Sir Ivor Herbert; and had reinstated on the Committee (previously discharged in respect of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill): Dr. Macnamara.

Report to lie upon the Table.

COMPANIES (DEBENTURES AND DEBENTURE STOCK) BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301.]

ADJOURNMENT.

LORD ROBERT CECIL (Marylebone, E.) rose in his place, and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the failure of the Government to secure the due payment of the salaries of the teachers in the non-provided schools in Merionethshire;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, MR. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen,

The Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until a quarter past Eight, this evening.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL (ALLOCATION OF TIME.)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) moved the Resolution of which he had given notice for the purpose of bringing the Report stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill to a conclusion in three allotted days. He said that this Bill had been about three months before the Standing Committee. Twenty-two days had been absorbed in its discussion by the Committee, the Committee sitting from 11.30 a.m. to 4 p.m. It could not be said, therefore, that the measure had been otherwise than thoroughly considered, if it was presumed that the Committee had applied itself to the honest and straightforward consideration of its provisions. The Committee was composed of the Scottish Members, and, being a Bill relating to Scotland, it ought not to need a very protracted consideration on Report. Of course, he was aware that a prolonged discussion in the Committee was maintained by the English Members, and it was urged in justification of the exercise of their right that the principles involved in the Bill might be extended to England. On the proverbial principle, therefore, they thought that it was desirable to oppose the Bill on its first introduction to Scotland. But, as far as that argument had any force, it ought not to be allowed to override the plain rights of the Scottish Members to have their own law. In addition to that, the Government had introduced another Bill dealing almost with the same subject in England, and the Government were showing that there was a considerable difference between the two countries. It had never been the desire of the Government to restrict the fullest opportunity for the discussion of notable and important points. The group of Clauses 1 to 6 had occupied twelve sittings of the Standing Committee. The first clause occupied four and a half sittings, and he believed that the closure was moved at the end of the fourth sitting. The second clause also took four sittings. Undoubtedly, the first three clauses were the most important in the Bill, for they established the general principles of statutory tenure under which the small holdings were to be held. But the Government thought that so long a discussion, and after such a riddling and sifting in Committee, ought to enable the Report stage to be passed without great difficulty. Clause 4 was also important, in view of the proposals it contained, but the other clauses were comparatively uncontroversial. On the second day the Government proposed to take Clauses 7 to 15. Of these, Clause 7 would be the most contentious, as it dealt with the procedure of breaking up land into small holdings, whether by agreement or compulsion. Nearly three sittings of the Standing Committee were given to the consideration of this clause. He did not know that Clauses 8 and 9 would give rise to much discussion, or, indeed, that there were any points in the group that were especially contentious, unless it were Clause 15, which was certainly important, as it amended the provisions of the Crofters Act in regard to the taking of land for the enlargement of holdings. On the third day it was proposed to take Clauses 16 to 31. This was a large group, no doubt, but it was one which had been threshed out elsewhere. His right hon. friend had taken steps in Clause 16 to carry out the undertaking that had been given on the Second Reading of the Bill, that the landlord should not suffer if, owing to the operations of the authorities set up by the Bill, the small holdings established or compulsorily taken proved a failure. By this clause the Government thought that they had fulfilled their engagement, and he hoped that it would not need much discussion.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Report stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill be brought to a conclusion in three allotted days; and (a) That the new Clauses and Clauses 1 to 6 of the Bill be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; and (b) That Clauses 7 to 15 of the Bill (if and so far as not previously disposed of) be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; and (c) That the remaining Clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage of the Bill to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded with on the third allotted day and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day. Any day on which the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day shall be considered an alloted day for the purposes of this Order. At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, or if that day is a Friday, at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any new Clauses or Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Clauses or Amendments), and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new Clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be. Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order "Time for taking Private Business," be taken immediately after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order "Sittings of the House." At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first order of the day, or if that day is a Friday or Saturday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill. After the passing of this order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill stand as first order of the day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to re-commit the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate.—*(Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.)*

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that the right hon. Gentleman, he remembered, made an observation a few years ago to the effect that guillotine Motions reduced the proceedings of the House to a farce. That was in the days when guillotine Motions were few and far between, and when they were only moved in respect of one Bill, or, at the most, two Bills in the course of a session. The right hon. Gentleman, who thought that this method reduced proceedings to a farce—he did not know what was lower than a farce in stage terminology—had greatly improved on his predecessors, and he had reduced, or was in the process of reducing, their proceedings, if not to a farce, at all events to a burlesque. Not content with reducing the proceedings to a burlesque once in a session, he thought that the right hon. Gentleman had moved this closure by compartments resolution already three times this session—a larger Parliamentary offspring of the right hon. Gentleman's brain than any of his predecessors were able to produce in the same length of time. Even that family did not content the right hon. Gentleman, and it appeared that the House was not to be allowed to retire to bed that night until it had left the right hon. Gentleman the proud and happy father of twins. The magnitude of the proposals that the right hon. Gentleman proposed to debate that evening were in inverse proportion to the defence which he had thought fit to make of them in what he would not call a speech, but in the few observations which he had condescended to make to the House. The right hon. Gentleman was great on records, and he had made a record this session. Though the right hon. Gentleman had not done much in the way of defending his Motion, he had said one or two things which deserved some slight commentary. In the first place he said that the Bill to be dealt with was a purely Scottish Bill. According to his opinions—and he was the most distinguished of Scottish Members—the Bill was purely Scottish; and a Scottish Bill was, in his opinion, a Bill to which any treatment might be meted out. But it was not a purely Scottish Bill. In the first place it affected the position of the Agricultural Department for the whole of England and Scotland, and it must have a great effect upon the future administrative work of the Department. His right hon. friend the Member for South Dublin had told him that it would have been impossible for him to carry out the reforms he effected in connection with rabies and other forms of disease attacking flocks had the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture not had the universality which the Bill proposed to destroy. Then, if they were not dealing, as they certainly were not, with Scotland alone what was this new doctrine that the Prime Minister had developed? He had announced in so many words that in legislating for Scotland it was nonsense to take into account those broad general principles which the Opposition considered, or which the House might consider, and had the right to consider, as applicable to all parts of the United Kingdom. Parliament was not only to legislate, but to think, in water-tight compartments. They were to have different principles when they were discussing the same problem. The same problem was to be discussed on one set of principles north of the Tweed, and on another set of principles south of the Tweed. That was—the right hon. Gentleman would forgive him for saying so—the most inept defence of the most foolish measure which so far as he knew had ever been presented to that House by a responsible Government. When the right hon. Gentleman declared that this strange and fantastic scheme of legislation was only to apply to Scotland, and that, therefore, English Members were travelling outside their proper function when they attempted to criticise it at all, he was no doubt doing a very good service to the colleague sitting next to him, than whom no man more needed shelter from unkind criticism, but a very great injustice to the legislative duties of that House. But the next argument of the right hon. Gentleman was even more absurd than the one he had just dealt with.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Hear, hear!

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What was the argument? He was sure he could convince the right hon. Gentleman of the appropriateness of the epithet. The right hon. Gentleman told them that the first six clauses were the most important in the Bill, but that they had been discussed so long in Grand Committee that he thought one night was sufficient for discussing them and the new clauses as well on Report by half-past ten o'clock. Had the right hon. Gentleman reflected on the duties that he was attempting to throw on the Grand Committees? The right hon. Gentleman was a Member of the Scottish Grand Committee, but, of course, it was impossible for him to attend, or for the Chancellor of the Exchequer who was also a member to attend. [Mr. ASQUITH was understood to dissent.] The right hon. Gentleman attended once for twenty minutes in the course of twenty-two days that the Bill was before the Grand Committee. That was an exception which most happily and conclusively proved the rule. There were members of the Front Opposition Bench who found it equally impossible to attend from twelve to three as was the earlier practice, or from eleven to four o'clock as was the later practice. How on earth was a Committee of that kind in any true sense to be regarded as representative of the House? None of those who were not members of the Committee knew anything of the procedure of the Committee except by hearsay. But he had heard strange things—as, for instance, that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill had only two arguments. One of them was that never had there been so excellent a piece of legislation as the Scotch Crofters Bill; and the other argument, even more pertinent and effective, was the Motion that "the Question be now put." He was informed that the right hon. Gentleman asked for the closure on fifty-three occasions, and got it on fifty, so that he just made his "half-century." He was sure that the right hon. Gentleman had been well advised to move the closure. It got him out of a great many embarrassments. He did not criticise the right hon. Gentleman's action. No doubt it was dictated by motives of most carefully thought-out prudence. But he must point out that a Committee, on which the average attendance was not more than forty or fifty, which the most important members of the Treasury Bench could not attend any more than a large number of Members on the Opposition side of the House, and in which the closure was moved fifty times, could in no sense be a reflection of the will, intelligence, and argumentative powers of that House. Therefore, to say, as the Prime Minister said, that, because the important clauses of this Bill took so many days in that Committee, it was not necessary to devote more than six hours and a half to them on Report, was an argument worthy of a Motion which, in the words of the Prime Minister himself, turned the proceedings of the House into a farce. The right hon. Gentleman was not content with merely maiming debate on the Report Stage of the Bill by using the guillotine, but he was determined to make ineffective such discussion as he chose to allow by carrying on, at the same time, consideration of the Scottish Bill in that House and another Scottish Bill in Committee upstairs. It was impossible to ignore the deliberate statement of policy which the right hon. Gentleman made last Thursday when he said that he proposed to ask Scottish Members to sit all the morning discussing the second most foolish Bill of the Session and all the afternoon and evening discussing the most foolish Bill. However foolish a Bill might be, it was impossible to throw such a burden on those who had properly the right to debate it. When the right hon. Gentleman was bringing forward his Grand Committee Resolution he declared that there was to be no undue strain thrown on Members of the House. ["No."] Did anybody doubt that the Prime Minister said that? Let them contradict him if he was wrong, but nobody who heard the Prime Minister's speech on that occasion was likely to deny it. To ask the same persons to devote all their time and attention to so novel and revolutionary a proposal as the Scottish Land Values Bill in the morning and then to discuss the Scottish Small Landholders Bill in the afternoon was deliberately to violate the implied understanding which the right hon. Gentleman gave to the House when he moved his Grand Committee Resolution. He was utterly at a loss to understand how the right hon. Gentleman could so far forget what was due to the House as to make proposals of that kind. No doubt they would save some trouble to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Small Landholders Bill. The right hon. Gentleman reminded him of a timid and inexpert rider, who insisted on his groom's exercising his steed severely in the morning so as to reduce it to the level of his powers of equitation by the time he mounted it himself in the afternoon. That might be very convenient for the right hon. Gentleman, but he ventured to say that it was excessively unfair on those English Members—and there were English Members on the Grand Committee—who ought, and he hoped would, devote their most careful attention to the work. So that here they had a Bill of the utmost importance not discussed, so far as the proceedings of that House were concerned, except on three truncated days which the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister proposed to allow them, and on which they had already exhausted those people who were best qualified to take part in the discussion in the evening by throwing upon them the perfectly absurd burden of having to sit in the morning. He wondered whether the right hon. Gentleman remembered the statement he made earlier in the session, in which he promised that he would not send upstairs to Grand Committees any important controversial measures. What had become of that Parliamentary pledge? Either the right hon. Gentleman thought that a Bill which applied to Scotland must, because it applied to Scotland, be necessarily insignificant, or else he really could not have read the provisions of the measure in respect of which he was now proposing the guillotine. It would be out of order and quite unnecessary to discuss the merits of the Bill now, but was there a single human being who had read the measure who doubted in the first place its importance, and in the second place the fact that it ran directly in the teeth of every sound principle of land legislation ever held, so far as he knew, by any serious school of political thinkers in this country? [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] It could not be acceptable to those who favoured land nationalisation, because when it was compared with that school of thought this measure was hopelessly illogical and foolish, and did not fit in with the views of extremists. Let them that take the ordinary Liberal and Radical as he was only a few years ago. Such men held, and Mr. Gladstone undoubtedly believed, that dual ownership was in itself an evil, that it ought only to be brought into legislation where it existed ethically and morally already, and that far better than dual ownership was that single ownership which could be proposed by way of purchase, a system which had been adopted in Ireland with the consent of every hon. Member on both sides of the House. Was it not a very big matter to revolutionise these fixed traditions of policy which were common to every school of thought in the House — Radicals, Liberals, Irish Nationalists, Unionists, Conservatives, and Tories? And now, in a light-hearted fashion, after three days of debate carried on under the guillotine, which destroyed and had always destroyed good debate in the House, the Secretary for Scotland came down as a great revolutionist and asked them to adopt, with regard to parts of Scotland, which, as everybody knew, were absolutely identical in their land system with England, a system which would have horrified every single Member of the Party to which the right hon. Gentleman belonged who had expressed his views on the land question in the last two or three generations. That was a very serious matter. Not only was this legislation bad, but the method of dealing with it was worse, and it was absolutely inconsistent with every pledge which the Prime Minister gave them as to the class of Bills which he was prepared to send upstairs in order to relieve congestion in the House. And if anything could add to the absurdity of a procedure which, in itself, was, he thought, sufficiently open to comment and criticism, it was that on the same night they were being asked to bring to a premature end two Bills both dealing with land of the same kind, held on the same tenure, worked in the same way, but dealing with that land on entirely different principles. At four o'clock the Prime Minister had moved a resolution that they should, under the guillotine, declare next Thursday or Friday that so far as Scottish land was concerned two and two made five. The Prime Minister was also going to move a second Resolution which would come on at some unknown hour that evening in which he was going to cut down the discussion on the English Land Bill to the same limits under the guillotine, and in that case they were going to declare that two and two made three. He could not understand how anybody with a serious countenance could propose these two Resolutions to prevent the House from discussing two quite inconsistent and different methods of dealing with one great problem. The real secret of the whole thing was let out in a moment of unfortunate candour by the President of the Irish Board of Agriculture last week when he explained to an interested and amused House that he belonged to a Government which worked in water-tight compartments. The natural result was that the head of each of those water-tight compartments looked with disgust and indignation at his colleagues who happened to preside over other water-tight compartments. The President of the Irish Board of Agriculture did not think much of the President of the Board of Education in England in the matter of dealing with the law of the land, because he told them he was going to preserve the law, although he implied that it was his misfortune and not his fault that he was the colleague of a right hon. Gentleman who did not intend to maintain the law. The same with regard to the relations between the Minister in charge of the English Agricultural Bill and the right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Scottish Agricultural Bill. They required Resolutions passed on the same night, but they would be shocked at being lumped together in the same Resolution. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the English Land Bill was not, he thought, in his place; but he was sure he would look with deepest indignation at any suggestion that he should be thought to be trafficking with any of the schemes of the Secretary for Scotland, and, if they were hastily or rashly to confuse him and his procedure with his Scottish colleague and his procedure, he would have the same feeling of indignation which, he understood, was felt by a West Indian mulatto when he was described as a black. He wondered whether the right hon. Gentleman who was responsible for their procedure had reflected on the point to which he had now succeeded in bringing debates in the House. He had made them shorter, but he had not made them to the point. He had deprived the House absolutely of the power of discussing the details of any of the measures he brought forward. He wisely protected his colleagues from any of the disagreeables which naturally ensued when criticism affected the careless drafting or the weak logic of any measure which the Government brought forward, and, so far from occupying his time as he understood he proposed to do, with filling up the cup with regard to another place, it seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman was occupied in giving a great practical demonstration of the absolute necessity of some legislative Chamber where discussion and revision were still possible. As far as the House of Commons was concerned, they had got far beyond the stage of farce to which the right hon. Gentleman had so eloquently referred a few months ago, and nobody now expected, and some people were ceasing even to desire, an opportunity for discussing proposals, however important, however far-reaching, however novel might be the principles on which they were founded. He did not believe that hon. Gentlemen opposite would reconcile themselves to this method of dealing with great social problems if it were not that they knew, as well as those on that side of the House knew, that there was another Chamber. He did not believe that they would tolerate the careless drafting, the hasty legislation, the crude and even foolish proposals with which the Government now, without hesitation or a blush, inundated that House, or that they would stoop to defend them if it was not that they said—"After all, it does not matter much what the Government do. We can always trust to the grosser absurdities being removed from the legislation which this House sanctions by another place." And if, in the process of making legislation reasonable and tolerable, they could get material for a few perorations about a hereditary Chamber, why, so much the better. He did not know that that was a very noble policy, but he thought it was a very ingenious one. He was far from desiring not to give full credit where credit was due, and, while he was unable to compliment the right hon. Gentleman on the wisdom of his measures, or on the care with which they had been drafted, or on the success with which they had been defended either in the House or upstairs, at all events he could and did compliment him from his heart on the ingenuity of the general scheme of procedure with which he had entertained the House, shortened its proceedings, and destroyed its efficiency during this and the preceding sessions.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman had shown more than his usual command of denigratory rhetoric. He had represented this Measure as one of the most inept and one of the most revolutionary ever introduced into Parliament, except the Scottish Valuation Bill, which he found to be still more inept and still more revolutionary. [Several HON. MEMBERS: The other way about.] The other way about. It did not matter much; it was all the same to the right hon. Gentleman. Both fell within the same category, and which got the place of pre-eminence was a matter of complete indifference to him. Then there was the English Land Bill also, and the right hon. Gentleman told them that whereas this Bill was like a legislative enactment of a proposition that two and two made five, the English Bill was an enactment of the other proposition that two and two made three. It was a very odd thing that the Bill which said that two and two made three was not divided on upon the Second Reading, and that the revolutionary Valuation Bill now upstairs received recognition in the late Parliament by a majority of something like 200. The less said about inept and revolutionary Bills the better.

The real point was the objection of the right hon. Gentleman to the procedure of sending Bills to Committees upstairs for their Committee stage. The whole gist of the argument, in so far as it was relevant, was that this Bill ought never to have been sent to a Standing Committee. It was so sent, however, and was anyone going to say that it did not receive in Committee ample, detailed, and, if he might use the expression, meticulous consideration? It was true of himself that he did not attend the deliberations of the Committee with much regularity, but he heard a good deal of the enormities which were said to be carried on in secret there, so he thought he would visit that chamber of horrors; and the half-hour he spent there was occupied almost entirely by English Members. [Cries of "Half-an-hour."] It might have been an exceptional occasion, but his impression appeared to tally with that of many of his hon. friends that English and Irish Members took their full share in the deliberations on the Bill. The Committee sat twenty-two days, ten hours a week, during three months of Parliamentary time.

He said frankly that the object of the new procedure was to get rid of Committee stage in the House, and the Government believed that was to the advantage of careful legislation. Complicated details of measures of this kind could be much more freely, thoroughly, and effectively handled under the comparatively informal conditions of the Standing Committee than in the House. [An Hon. Member: Closure.] An hon. Member said the Bill was closured. Was he horrified at that? A closure on the average after two and a half hours of discussion compared favourably with procedure in Committee of the Whole House. No one could deny that the Committee sat long and sat often, and had every opportunity of considering the measure with fulness and care. If it was otherwise, then he said legislation had become impossible. He was not enamoured of the closure. He regarded it as a temporary palliative for the evils of our present Parliamentary system. The right hon. Gentleman opposite developed the use of the guillotine to a degree previously unknown. He did not say they were not bettering his example. He should be sorry to regard it as part of the permanent machinery of the House of Commons, but until there was some business-like arrangement for allocating time between different Bills and different stages of Bills this was the only way by which the majority could, after giving full opportunity for discussion, make its voice effective. On that ground, and that ground only, the Government submitted this Motion to the House.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer laid stress on the words "careful legislation" in reference to the discussions upstairs. If that was the desire to be attained by the Government, they might have been expected in using the closure to apply it only to particular questions and not to whole portions of clauses. Those members of the Standing Committee who attended the sittings were perfectly aware that some portions of clauses were passed entirely undiscussed, and certainly no one could say that there had been that carefulness in legislation which the Chancellor of the Exchequer said was the great object of having the Bill discussed upstairs. Another matter which had not been alluded to was that the Members of the House generally had had no means of ascertaining the points which really had been discussed, the lines laid down on points of order, or the statements made by Ministers in connection with the Bill. When he asked a question in regard to that matter the Prime Minister told him that he ought to read the Scottish papers. That was the manner in which they were to discover what was going on in the Standing Committee. Surely that was hardly a dignified way of carrying on legislation! They were to get their information in the highways and byways, and they had even to go to the Scottish papers for reports of what was going on. If that was the case, surely there could be no objection to asking questions on the floor of the House, especially when they remembered the statements which were made by right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench when the new procedure rules were discussed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton stated that under the proposal for referring Bills to Standing Committees there would be reserved to the House the fullest opportunity for discussion on the Report stage. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the Government proposed no limitation of discussion on the Report stage. What had been the actual condition of things, especially with reference to this Bill? There was the fact that of 588 Members only fifteen representing Ireland, Wales, and England who were added to the Committee had an opportunity of saying a word upon this extremely complicated measure. There was every ground, therefore for suggesting that this was a novel procedure, that it was one contrary to the pledges of the Government, and one which ought to be resisted, however small the minority might be. Having got the whole time of the House, the Government now suggested that on the Report stage the Bill should be discussed between a quarter to four and half-past ten o'clock. Let the Government give the House the whole of the time allotted to them. At all events they asked that some concession should be made. The actual allocation of time suggested was based on the most extraordinary principle. As to the new clauses, even the Government must allow that out of 588 hon. Members there might be some who had suggestions to make when they were changing the entire land system of Scotland. After the new clauses there were six clauses which the Prime Minister admitted were the most important in the Bill, and all these were to be discussed between 4.30 and 10.30 p.m. As had been pointed out by the right hon. Member for the City of London, there was a clause which broke up the present Board of Agriculture. He believed that the members of that Board and all interested in agriculture would view with the greatest regret the severance of Scotland from the Board of Agriculture. The Board had been gradually built up; it had attained a *status* and a position of a very substantial character, and that was only because it had under its control the agriculture of England, Wales, and Scotland. He himself had been connected with a Departmental Committee on Sheep Scab, and the only possible way of dealing with that disease was by united action in Scotland and Wales and that had diminished its effect in England. The same thing might be said in regard to many other important subjects. Again, they did not know whether this Bill included fisheries, and under the operation of the guillotine there could be no particular discussion on that point. However they looked at the matter—in view of the pledges given by the Government, the Opposition had been treated in a way no minority had ever been treated before. Therefore they were bound to make the strongest possible protest against the action of the Government. The Prime Minister had said in setting up these Grand Committees that the great measures of the session would still be retained under the control of the House. What were the great measures of the session? Let them clear one thing away. Would the Government claim that the two land measures were the great measures of the session, although they said that they had always intended to send these measures to Grand Committee? It had been said that if they looked at the Order Book they would see what were the main measures of the Government. He did not think it necessary to read them through, but at all events they knew from the position that was given to the two Land Bills and the arguments that were used about them that they were going to be used by the Government as their great effort at legislation. If that were the case, and if they were to be used as the means of piling up the agony against the other House, then opportunity should be given to the House of Commons to discuss them so that the arguments that could be brought to bear against them might be reported, printed, and considered by the public. Such opportunity had not yet been given. The whole information which the vast majority of the Members of the House and of the public had in regard to these Bills had been gleaned from the public newspapers or conversations with members of the Committee. He trusted that a very strong protest would be made against the action taken by the Government.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said he agreed very much with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the use of the guillotine was not an ordinary procedure that they would like to think had become inevitable. The time allowance made for discussion before the guillotine fell was too short, especially when they compared the time allowance given to the Scottish Bill with that given to the English Bill. He was one of those who had been grateful to the Prime Minister for having established the Grand Committee system, because that was the only way by which work could be done without a very large devolution of powers which he conceived the Opposition would oppose more than Grand Committees. If the Grand Committees were to provide for thorough discussion, there should be an adequate report of the proceedings; there should be the usual guidance from the Chair as in the House, and the closure should not be applied too freely. He had a marked copy of the Bill showing what portions had been carried under closure; and it revealed a very remarkable result. He doubted whether the discussion in Committee had been satisfactory, considering the extent to which closure had been used upstairs. It might be said that legislation under present conditions would be impossible without closure. It was not, but the objection was not so much to procedure as to the Bill itself. He did not object, of course, to the guillotine, but if three days were wanted for the English Bill then five times as many would not be too many for the Scottish Bill. Assuming that six days were to be given to the English Bill, he would, as a practical proposal, suggest that one day should be given to the English Bill on Report and five days to the Scottish Bill on Report. The English Bill was a very plain measure. It followed full inquiry. It utilised existing machinery and the local authorities. It was no bar to individual initiative, but provided a stimulus to it. It provided coercion both to the individual and to the local authorities. It secured flexibility of tenure, disorganised nothing, and provided for experimental work which was so particularly recommended by the Select Committee. The English Bill was a practical, not a political, Bill; it was accepted very generally by public opinion, and received a very large measure of support, not from one side of politics, but from both, which was fully justified during the Second Reading. It was carried through the Committee without the use of the closure, and was amended fairly. He could only say that if a similar Bill had been applied to Scotland, only one day would have been necessary for the Report stage of both Bills. He agreed with those who had spoken on the other side; for, after all, the difference between the conditions of Scotland and those of England was that in Scotland the equipment of farms was more costly, farm-servants were better paid, farming was of a higher character, and therefore there was less need to interfere so far as economic farming was concerned than in England. The Scottish Bill had been declared by the Prime Minister himself to be entirely different from the English Bill. That was so, but in the differences it was exactly opposite to the English Bill. Its origin had never been disclosed; it was the result of no inquiry; there was no precedent for its main provisions; no cause had been shown for it. Scotland was keen enough for land reform, but he had seen no keenness amongst practical men for the Bill. There had been a great division of Parliamentary opinion in respect to some of its clauses. In many of them it was destructive and not constructive. All these considerations afforded solid ground for asking for some time for its discussion. There was no practical defence of the Bill on the Second Reading. When certain points were discussed by the Opposition they were told that these were Committee points, and in Committee they were told that they were Second Reading points. Another objection taken by some hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House was that within the scope of the Bill there was the principle of divided ownership and divided management. And in Committee there was rather a stalwart minority instead of a stalwart majority in favour of the Bill. The stalwart minorities who were out-and-out supporters of all its provisions were not representative of agriculture. The Bill in respect of certain of its provisions ought to be considered on Report in the House as a whole, and that could not be done unless more time was allowed. It was said there was obstruction in the Committee upstairs. He denied that. No doubt the Bill took a long time, but, after all, it provided material for half-a-dozen Bills. He never recollected a Bill with so many different and contentious subjects embodied in it. It effected a revolution of tenure in the law of property and rating, and in agricultural organisation. The Opposition Amendments were moved upstairs on clear lines, and he thought they ought to be moved again. The Amendments which ought to be considered by the House were to omit these provisions which were unjustifiable, to recast other provisions upon practicable working lines, to remove those hampering restrictions which were said to check the real object of the Bill, which was to increase the population upon the soil, and to make adequate provisions for silviculture and intense cultivation. They were told that the land system had broken down. It certainly had not broken down so far as agricultural efficiency in Scotland was concerned. The Bill only dealt with small farms, upon which there was the greatest possible expenditure by way of equipment. He had great sympathy with a restrictive provision as applied to bad owners, but the Bill hit the best owners. They were told that ownership was left untouched, but the Government really destroyed ownership. They were told also that the Bill was the considered policy of an enlightened Government, but Ministers who he should have thought knew most about the practical management of land exercised great restraint in their expressions of opinion. With their feet on mother earth, they had to face visionaries in the clouds. He admired the way in which the Secretary for Scotland tried to introduce some measure of supernatural law into the economies of agricultural law, but it was not business. The evils of divided ownership and the absence of responsible management which would be inflicted by the Bill would be irreparable. They would be driven on the rocks of litigation. It would end in wholesale expropriation by land purchase. That would be the consequence of the Bill. The results should be made plain to the House, and these points therefore ought to receive further and adequate consideration. He remembered that last year one of the Whips of the Liberal Party demonstrated that the people were against Socialism. He had never demonstrated that he was against Socialism, because so far as they could work collectively with equal efficiency to working individually he was a Socialist. He would, however, ask those who were so afraid of Socialism why—if it was equitable to appropriate capital invested in the equipment of land, and if it was equitable to transfer that to the occupiers, as the hon. Baronet the Member for Inverness-shire frankly acknowledged was the consequence of the Bill—it would not be equitable to divide up large houses into suitable smaller dwellings and thus solve the housing problem? If they could take the control and appropriate all the capital that was invested in the equipment of land in Scotland, to the extent of £100,000,000, and was still being invested at the rate of £2,000,000 a year, it seemed to him they could do that. The nationalisation of the land was a mild measure compared to the proposals of the Bill. No Socialist had ever proposed anything so destructive to individual initiative and to industrial efficiency.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was really now discussing the Bill, and not the Motion before the House.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said he was advancing these arguments to prove the need for giving a much larger proportion of time to the Scottish Bill than to the English Bill under the provisions of the guillotine. He submitted that a fair division of time would be one day to the Report stage of the English Bill and five days to the Scottish Bill.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.) said the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down would convince the Prime Minister that all the opposition to the Bill did not come from the English Members. The Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a somewhat savage attack on the English Members who had sat on the Committee upstairs. The Prime Minister told them they had no right to over-ride the right of Scotland to make her own laws, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer asked what right they had to speak on the Committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer forgot that they had to pay some of the taxation under the Bill. This was the first time he had heard two Members of the Liberal Party say that those who were going to be taxed should have no right to enter into the discussions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that he objected to guillotine methods and that he thought some better arrangements might be made upstairs. He seemed to have forgotten that the very question of the procedure upstairs was guillotined by the Government. There were Amendments put down to regulate the proceedings upstairs and to simplify them, and they would have avoided some of the deplorable scenes which had taken place. He did not think anything occurred on the Scottish Grand Committee of which any English Member at all events need be ashamed. The Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that their opinion was formed on hearsay evidence. Discussions on the merits of the Bill were handicapped, and in his opinion most of them were unworthy of being handicapped at all. He did not wish to say anything offensive to the Scottish Members of the Committee, but he would like to point out some of the reasons why the Committee took so much time. It was not because there was too much talk, but because there was too little information. One of the characteristics of Scottish people was that they were niggardly in giving information amongst other things. It was a characteristic of Scottish people of old standing. Since he had been on the Scottish Grand Committee he had become imbued with Scottish, so that he could hardly read anything but Scottish literature. One day, however, he had to take up an English author of some repute who wrote a Scottish play called "Macbeth." When Macbeth visited the three old maids on the Scottish heath, he said:—

"Stay, you imperfect speakers, tell me more."

That was the complaint he had to make of the hon. Gentleman who conducted the Bill for the Government. They were always met by the Solicitor-General for Scotland with a stony silence. Throughout the whole proceedings he was treated as a Sphinx. Every now and then the Lord Advocate treated them with appeals of eloquence, and the Secretary for Scotland on every possible occasion moved the closure. The hon. Members for Sutherland and Ross and Cromarty frequently objected to the closure, and, as for all the opposition coming from the English Members, he would like to ask the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty what he thought of the Bill. He continually told them—

"My heart's in the Highlands,
My heart's in the Highlands,
My heart is not here;
My heart's in the Highlands
Achasing the deer."

Why should these measures be passed by sixty-two Scottish Members without any discussion by the English Members? They did not always get a quorum. Out of sixty-two Scottish Members they could only muster sixteen. He merely mentioned that to show the estimation in which this Bill was held by Scottish Members. It was said that the Bill had taken twenty-two days in Committee. What occurred? On the twenty-first day when they were dealing with the land in the burghs the right hon. Gentleman had to confess that he had not the slightest idea of the numbers of acres in the burghs or of the number of people living on them. On the twenty-second day he put a question to the Solicitor-General as to whether the Bill if it passed would prevent an owner selling land to an occupier, and the hon. and learned Gentleman could give no answer, and the Secretary for Scotland said himself that that was a matter which would have to be dealt with in the House. Thirty-three promises were made by the Government, and were all to be carried out by the Government by way of new clauses. It was now proposed to discuss the Bill in three short sittings. It had been said by the Prime Minister that twenty-two days in Committee was too much time for the Bill, which violated every principle of the land laws. He noticed that a small private water Bill, the Renfrew Water Bill, had taken eight days in Committee, and if eight days were required to consider a small private water Bill twenty-two days were not half enough time for the consideration of this. It was not that he had so much fault to find with the closure being applied as the manner in which it was applied. Comparatively unimportant Amendments were moved and a great deal of time was wasted in discussing them. If the closure had been put upon such debates as those he would not have objected. But debates were allowed to run for a long time on unimportant Amendments, and then whole pages of the Bill were closured without any discussion at all. The fact was that these guillotine Motions were pre-arranged. The difficulties were foreseen, and when the Committee were discussing one clause they were referred to another. When on Clause 5 they were referred to Clause 10, and when on Clause 7 to a new sub-clause, and when they got on to that clause they were closured. He moved an Amendment in the first line of Clause 7, but it was closured with half the page that followed. An Amendment was raised in regard to the question of compensation, which was one of the most important parts of the Bill. But the Secretary for Scotland never responded, and the law officers for Scotland were most discreetly silent when important questions were raised. Then there were no lawyers in the Opposition, and when the lay Members applied as they often did to the Solicitor-General for Scotland for assistance to understand these abstruse points they were met with a stony silence. It was under these circumstances that they now required more than three days to consider the Bill. The three days given under the Resolution destroyed all freedom of discussion. He thought the process of devolution under which English Members were told they were not to discuss Scottish Land Bills and that the English Land Bill was good enough for them was worse than any form of Home Rule over contemplated. It set class against class and country against country, and he most emphatically protested against the tyranny of the Resolution.

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes) said the House was now accustomed to the annual comedy by which the Government of the day had to come down and with the greatest reluctance, as they said, muzzle the House of Commons. It could not be gainsaid that this procedure had been more and more drastic, until at last every sensible man in the House was subconsciously crying out for some less clumsy, more fair and more business-like method of curtailing the debates. The Government were making a more wholesale use of the guillotine than any previous Government, and this was due to the fact that so much important legislation had been introduced so late in the House of Commons. He put it to the House that there was no precedent for the procedure by which the whole House had no opportunity to consider the details of an important measure before the 5th of August. He held that the Government had stifled liberty of speech in the House as no previous Government had done, and he thought all dispassionate Members of the House were convinced that the present method of obtaining measures by means of the guillotine was indefensible. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was a temporary palliative that had lasted too long. But under those circumstances it was the duty of the Government to tackle the question and provide another method. The hon. Member for Salford, an extreme Radical, only the other day in a letter to the public Press said that he was extremely anxious to carry advanced legislation, but that there was something more important than that, viz., freedom of speech in the House of Commons. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had also spoken against this method. It could not be denied that the most important parts of Bills from the point of view of efficient legislation went through without discussion, and that in itself proved the absolute necessity for the House of Lords. They saw that necessity in connection with the Education Bill brought in by the present Government last year, when the Amendments moved in another place on behalf of the Government bulked more largely than all the other Amendments moved in that House. The author of a Bill was not immaculate, and when he introduced a Bill he expected to have Amendments made and would welcome criticism directed to points which had escaped him. A strong Government should welcome a strong Opposition so that every clause of a Bill should be dealt with from both points of view. That was the only way to get legislation to work smoothly. He had no hesitation in saying that in their hearts the whole House unanimously wished that some other method could be found than that now proposed for dealing with surplus talk. Was it not the positive duty of the Prime Minister and members of the Government, with their enormous majority, and as guardians of the efficiency of the House, to take their courage in both hands, not to make difficulties, but to tackle this question in a manner which would restore efficiency to the House of Commons?

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he really thought that the aim of the Government was somewhat curious and topsy-turvy. He would recall to hon. Members opposite an opinion expressed by Sir George Trevelyan, that no Government composed of anything short of lunatics would propose to send highly contentious Bills to Grand Committees. The Prime Minister had expatiated at greater length on the same theme, and had assured himself and other hon. Members, in the discussion of procedure, that there was no necessity for their moving a large number of exceptions to the rule for sending Bills to Grand Committees, because highly contentious measures would not be sent upstairs. It followed from that statement that measures which were sent upstairs were, in the view of the Government, not highly contentious. He found that of the measures applicable to Scotland the Government had seen fit to retain two in the House, one the Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill, and the other the Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill. He assumed that if the definition of the Government was to be taken as correct, those two Bills were regarded as the Bills of the session, as highly contentious, and consequently were not sent upstairs. The other observation he had to make on the general question was this. In the earlier portion of the debate they had heard a reference by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the occasion on which he visited the Scottish Committee. The right hon. Gentleman was present for something like half an hour, and from his reference to it, one might be led to believe that the Scottish Grand Committee was a happy place where everything went smoothly. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that the closure had been used sparingly; but what were the facts? Over one third of the Bill had been passed under the operation of the guillotine. The Bill consisted of 790 lines, and of these 268 were framed under the operations of the guillotine. Were the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his place he would ask him, as he now asked any other member of the Government present, whether he considered that a reasonable and natural use of the guillotine, and whether, in the view of the Government, that was the sort of guillotine operation which they had to look forward to in the future. Regrettable charges had been made against Members of the Opposition of having obstructed the progress of the Bill in Committee. But he could reply to those charges on figures which he had taken the trouble to get out. One thousand two hundred and eighty-nine speeches were made in Grand Committee on the Scottish Small Landholders Bill, and of that number 636 were made by Unionist Members, and 653 by supporters of the Government. He thought these figures, which he was prepared to substantiate if required, effectively disposed, once and for all, of the charge of obstruction which had been made against Members on the Opposition side of the House.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said that the question was one of very great importance. The Prime Minister had brought forward the proposition in a very half-hearted way, and his supporters did not take the trouble to reply to the very solid arguments advanced against it. It was one of the most drastic proposals ever suggested to a legislative assembly anywhere, and he could imagine what hon. Members opposite would have said had the late Government brought in such a Motion as that with which they had now to deal. He had listened with interest and also with amazement to the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, made on 11th November, 1902, when after the Education Bill had been in Committee for thirty-eight days, the Closure Motion was moved by his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said—

> "I venture to say that until this debate, whether you look back to the precedents of the past or to the reason of the thing, both the theory and the practice of the House of Commons have been that this procedure which we all regret, which none of us like, which we admit to be

> inconsistent with the elementary rights and privileges of a debating assembly—this procedure has never been, and ought not to be resorted to except in one or two cases in a case of extreme emergency, in the interests of public order or in the case where a Bill, having been carefully considered both by the country and by Parliamentary discussion, is ripe for a final decision. What are you doing here? You are violating those traditions; you are flying in the face of experience; you are establishing a precedent which, I venture to say, once established will be repeated and applied in cases which will be extremely unwelcome to the large majority of those who are going to vote for this motion."

Was there any reason if they quickened their deliberations and their legislation in the manner that was now being adopted, why in the future the whole fiscal system of the country should not be changed entirely in perhaps two or three days, or why some future Budget should not be passed in a similar time? The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer went on to add—

> "You are going to apply this procedure, which has hitherto been confined within limited and rational bounds, to a measure which is at once complex and revolutionary, which is neither urgent in its occasion, nor temporary in its operation, as to which the country has never been consulted"——

he thought they might apply those observations to the present Motion, as to which the country had never been consulted—

> "against the hasty and ill-considered passage of which a second Chamber affords us no effectual safeguard."

He would like to refer to one very important point in the Prime Minister's observations, where he told them, that if the Scottish Members were satisfied with any Scottish measure, it ought to be passed into law. He wondered whether the right hon. Gentleman would apply the same law to Ireland or England. If he considered that the Scottish Members ought to have their will, as representing the Scottish people, in regard to any measure relating to Scotland, why should not the Irish Members have an opportunity of bringing in a measure somewhat different from the Irish Council Bill? They were told that the measure to which this Closure Resolution applied was not important. But that was said only in the House of Commons. When the right hon. Gentleman went to make a speech in the country or any of his followers made speeches in the Recess, they would say that this Scottish measure was one of the most important ever passed for Scotland. He thought the day would come when right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite would regret the decision at which they were going to arrive that day. He believed they would come to agree that the words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were correct, when he said that proceedings such as this were a most dangerous example.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said he had listened with considerable interest to the speeches of the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer and he entirely failed to see that they had advanced the slightest reason for passing this Resolution or pressing it on the House. While the people of the country were spending a peaceful holiday, the House of Commons was called upon to discuss two Resolutions which would have been absolutely unnecessary but for the incompetence of the Government. The Prime Minister reminded him of the Queen of Hearts in *Alice in Wonderland.* Whenever he found himself in difficulties about his legislative proposals, he at once shoulted, "Off with their heads!" At the present time he was guillotining Bill after Bill, Members were gradually becoming accustomed to the process, and now they found themselves in the unprecedented position of having two Resolutions before the House to deal with two most important Bills. Still, after a year and a half's experience of the present Government, one was hardly surprised at what they were doing. At the last election, right hon. and hon. Members opposite pledged themselves in favour of free speech, which in the House of Commons at the present moment they had absolutely destroyed. Every Bill was now forced through by means of the closure, and the only place where there was discussion was in the House of Lords, which also the Government had determined, if possible, to destroy. The Prime Minister had not made any case against the members of the Opposition, and he ventured to think that hon. Members on that side of the House would agree that it was not through any fault of the Opposition that the Government found themselves in their present predicament. The

Opposition had not obstructed any of the Government's measures; in fact, had they wished to do so they would have been deprived of the opportunity by the closure. The Government had themselves alone to thank for the position in which they found themselves. They had endeavoured in the course of the session to do far too much. The majority of Members on the Government Benches admitted that. Only the other day, an hon. Gentleman, a supporter of the Government, said he earnestly trusted that the present session would be a lesson to the Government for the future not to pass a tremendous number of measures in one session as they were now trying to do. The oldest Member of the House could not remember a Government which had got themselves into such a muddle with regard to their legislative proposals as had the present Government. They had introduced important Bills right up towards the end of the session, and now they were endeavouring to do in a few short weeks what should take as many months or more. The Resolution dealt with the Scottish Bill, which was one of the most contentious measure ever discussed in the House. Later on they had to discuss the closure Resolution on the English Bill which the Prime Minister had said was a non-contentious measure. Although the Opposition did not object to the principle of small holdings they objected to many of the details of the measure. That measure was fairly considered by the Committee upstairs, but the same could not be said of the Scottish Bill; member after member of the Scottish Committee had told the House that whole pages of the Bill were closured without any discussion whatever. He had nothing to say against the Chairman of the Committee, because he was esteemed and respected on all sides of the House, but he could not help saying that it was most remarkable that whenever the Secretary for Scotland requested that the closure should be applied, the right hon. Gentleman invariably acceded to the request. The Bill introduced a new system of land tenure in Scotland. It introduced dual ownership and he failed to see why the Government should make this experiment upon poor unfortunate Scotsmen. He protested against such a Bill being forced through without adequate discussion. How could hon. Members who were not members of the Scottish Committee adequately dismiss the proposals of this Bill on Report without the assistance of any official report of the proceedings? He wished to record his emphatic protest against this Resolution.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) protested against the way in which these fundamental changes in the rules which governed their procedure were being carried through. It was in no sense the fault of hon. Gentlemen opposite that they had had very short experience of Parliamentary work, having only been recently elected, and it was only natural that forming as they did a large majority of the House their desire should be to legislate as rapidly as possible, without due regard to the quality of their legislation or for the rights of the minority who were entitled by constitutional practice and usage to the fullest consideration in the discussion of measures brought forward. On the Grand Committee the voice of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was never heard, although he had interposed on this occasion for a short time and had been called away by the urgent demands of his office. But if the right hon. Gentleman was going to make a practice of intervening in these debates, and charging the Opposition with an undue prolongation of their criticisms, the least he could do was to listen to the defence hon. Members made, and their repudiation of the charges he had thought fit to make against them. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had been singularly unfortunate to-day. He had told them that he had a vivid recollection of the visit he paid to the Scottish Committee, but he appeared to have stopped short at a most important point. He desired to refer to it because it touched immediately upon the point he ventured to raise during the debate on the new rules, and which he was sorry to say he pressed upon the Prime Minister without success. By a curious coincidence when the Chancellor of the Exchequer visited the Scottish Committee they happened to be discussing a question which the Prime Minister thought English Members had no right to discuss, namely, the share they would have to find out of their own pockets towards the working of this particular Bill in Scotland. When they asked for more information on the subject they were met by the closure. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer was present at the Committee, one of his hon. friends spied him and referred to the fact that he was present. He himself had contemplated putting two definite Questions to the right hon. Gentleman on the Committee, but the moment he found his presence was detected he fled from the scene never to return. He knew it would be idle to expect Ministers of the Crown not immediately connected with the Department concerned to be present at the Committee, but could there be a greater condemnation of the system than that fact? If the Secretary for Scotland was in charge of a measure it was probable that his colleagues would be on the bench beside him, but when questions arose which were outside the immediate purview of the Minister in charge of the Bill, and when the Opposition made an effective point, what had been the invariable practice? The practice had been immediately to send a messenger to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's room or to the Prime Minister or some other Minister of the Crown to come and give an answer to the question and meet the argument if he could. The Prime Minister had insinuated that the debates had been too much addressed to small points and that sufficient attention had not been paid to matters of principle. That was the inevitable result of the practice which the Government had adopted. He would like to know where the demand for this Bill in Scotland came from? What single authority entitled to speak for agriculture in Scotland could be quoted in its support? Hon. Members opposite were divided in regard to the Bill; in fact the closure was the only thing they were united upon, because they knew its application would get rid of a subject which had caused them many searchings of heart, and because they found it extremely difficult to answer the arguments put forward by the Opposition. With regard to the question of finance, the Prime Minister had criticised the interference of English Members. He wished to say that a great deal of the information upon which the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had based their speeches was not accurate. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh!"] He did not believe the Prime Minister was accurate when he said the great bulk of the criticism on the Committee was carried on by English Members. Let him remind the House who some of those English Members were. Some of them were men interested in agricultural land, who had spent their money in developing and improving it. Were they to be told that because a man did not sit for a Scottish constituency, although he was largely interested in Scottish land, he was not a proper person to take part in the debates upstairs? The number of Members not connected with Scotland either by representation or ownership, or by a large occupation of land, was very small upon the Committee. They were told that the Bill had been adequately discussed. He did not think that any Bill dealing with three principles so great as the three great principles affected by this measure had ever received so little discussion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made the most of the fact that eleven days of Parliamentary time had been given to the Bill. It should be remembered that the Bill introduced into Scotland for the first time principles of legislation which had been followed in Ireland. The only result would be in Scotland as in Ireland that it would be found necessary to buy out the second party to the transaction. That was an entire revolution. It was a drastic amendment of the Crofters' Act which in itself, in the opinion of many hon. Members opposite, and especially those who represented the crofting counties, was a sufficient subject for legislation, and ought to have been the sole subject of legislation. The Government had in the case of England dealt with the question of small owners in one Bill, whereas in the case of Scotland that question had been lumped together with two or three other questions of almost equal importance. The Prime Minister had criticised somewhat adversely the action of English Members. If this Bill, which conferred autocratic power on the Secretary for Scotland, were put into force it would be impossible for anybody who sat on the Board of Agriculture of Great Britain to deal, as they had been able to deal hitherto, with some of those appalling diseases which had ravaged the country and destroyed so many of the cattle of the people. One case in his own experience was that of rabies. He ventured to say that if this change had been made, it would have been absolutely impossible to deal with that question in the way it was dealt with. The English Members were as much interested in these questions as Scottish Members. The justification given by the Secretary for Scotland for dealing with these matters in this Bill was that there was no such legislation with reference to Ireland. That was true; but Ireland was an island, and the subject of cattle diseases could be dealt with there in a way that was not practicable where, as in the case of Scotland, there was a land boundary. The hon. Member for the Leith Burghs had dealt with the effect of the Bill on Scottish land. He was not going to deal with that, but he would give one small bit of information which in itself was an answer to every argument used by the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The House would not believe that the Opposition had wasted time in the Grand Committee by discussing this measure in what was equal to twelve Parliamentary days. The Government were absolutely pledged on the Report stage to deal with, or at all events to reconsider, thirty different points, some of which were small, while others were of first-class importance. It was the action of the Opposition which led to this result. In the first place it led to the insertion in the Bill in Committee of several Amendments of first-rate importance. And yet they were told that the measure had been adequately discussed. [Cries of "Hear, hear!"] He understood that the hon. Gentlemen who cheered were anxious to get legislation through and would prefer bad legislation if they could get it through quickly. That did not happen to be the view of the Opposition, and he doubted very much whether it was ever likely to be their view. He did not believe it was necessary to move the closure fifty-three times, and there was proof of that to some extent. The tactics of the Minister in charge of the Bill were materially altered during the last four or five days the Bill was before the Committee. Curiously enough during those days the closure was never moved, although the debates were just as continuous and the interposition of Members of the Opposition just as frequent and determined as before. What was the result? Progress was two or three times more rapid than in the earlier stages of the Bill. He did not object to the closure in itself; it was part of our system and it would be ridiculous to object to it now. What he objected to was the method in which it was moved in Committee. During the debates on the new rules of procedure which provided for the application of the closure on the Grand Committees there was power reserved to the House for discussion on the Report stage. But if only a Bill was drawn with long enough sections the Minister in charge had only to move that the words down to the middle of the clause should stand part of the clause in order to prevent the discussion of a number of Amendments. In this case the Minister in charge introduced one Amendment of his own in a clause in order to place an extra charge on the Imperial revenue, and when he got that, he moved the closure down to the end of the clause. If that was not closure by compartments, it was first cousin to it. That appeared to be a use of the closure which was never contemplated by the House of Commons when the new rules were framed. Some portions of this Bill to which the Opposition attached the greatest importance were excluded from debate altogether by that method. He and his friends, and he believed many hon. Gentlemen opposite, were opposed to any alteration in the laws dealing with the Diseases of Animals Act which would weaken the hands of the British Government. That was a matter which affected our own trade with foreign countries. The only Amendment upon which they would have been able to discuss that question was closured by taking one half of a clause at one fell swoop. On more than one occasion there was doubt and difficulty on the Committee in regard to matters under discussion. If the Bil had been before Committee of the Whole House the Prime Minister would have been called in more than once, and he would have seen the necessity for some concession. It was absolutely idle and futile to blame the Opposition for what they did upstairs. However strong the majority behind a Government might be, no majority was so strong that it had not from time to time to make concessions.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Hear, hear!

MR. WALTER LONG said the right hon. Gentleman cheered that sentiment. In regard to nine-tenths of the Bill, not only was there no concession, but no attempt at concession. The Government presented a determined front, and argument after argument was met by pointing to the virtue of the Crofters Act, and it was held that this legislation was going to produce happiness and prosperity in Scotland.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman stated that there were thirty concessions made.

MR. WALTER LONG said he was sorry if he did not make himself clear. What he said was that the Government during the Committee stage had pledged themselves to reconsider thirty different points. That was a very different thing. The Prime Minister knew that a Government very often promised to consider a question in the most friendly way, that they did their best to meet the views of the Opposition, but not unnaturally the Government and the Opposition did not see the thing in the same light. Differences of opinion might arise as to what the Government had done in regard to the points they had promised to reconsider, and what chance was there that the reserved points would be properly dealt with? They were told by Ministers that closure by compartments was hateful to them. And yet they had made use of it more often than their predecessors. Even if they had a conference between the two sides of the House with the view of arranging the debates on the Report stage so as to bring them within three days, he doubted whether such an arrangement could be made with a Bill of this magnitude. The Government would say to the Opposition that they could select their own subjects and arrange the time for themselves. Fifteen new clauses were on the Paper, eight of them in the name of Scottish Members, and one by a supporter of the Government, while other Amendments dealt with totally different branches of the subject, such as the amendment of the Crofters Act, the Small Holdings Bill, the setting up of a Land Court, and the creation of a new Agricultural Department to the destruction of the English Agricultural Department. He did not think it was possible adequately to discuss these in three days. And let it be remembered that when the Government sought to justify their action by criticising the action of the Opposition, and by saying that the Opposition had been unreasonable in their demand, they were dealing with the Lowlands of Scotland and that the Opposition had on their side a man who had unique experience in regard to every branch of agriculture in that country. Nobody would say that that hon. Member had gone out of his way to oppose the Government except in this case. The Opposition had had throughout these discussions in Committee the sympathy and support of the hon. Member for Leith Burghs; and in regard to the crofting part of the Bill they had had the unfavourable and outspoken criticism of those who represented the crofting areas. Was there ever a case in which the Opposition had shown a cleaner record? The Bill was of the greatest importance and proposed to bring into Scotland a change in its land system which had proved disastrous in Ireland. The most representative men in Scotland, who did not usually vote on the Opposition side, and the great bulk of the farmers, opposed the Bill in its general outlines. If that was the case it could not be said that the Opposition had acted in a way in which they ought not to have acted. He regarded the great change proposed by the Resolution as a most insidious invasion of Parliamentary procedure and one which instead of curing an evil was likely to aggravate it. It would send legislation out of the House ill-digested, without the stamp of adequate discussion, and some of it never debated at all. Whatever effect that might have on another place, it would have a most disastrous effect on public opinion outside, and it was not likely to redound to the credit of the House or add to its usefulness as a legislative body.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said that the House had listened to what the right hon. Gentleman had said in regard to the proceedings in the Grand Committee. He acknowledged the fairness with which the right hon. Gentleman had treated the subject, although he differed from the right hon. Gentleman strongly as to what he had stated was the opinion of Scotland in regard to the Bill. He was not going to enter into the merits of their proceedings upstairs, except on one or two points in which his own conduct had been impugned. He ventured to assert that they approached the work of the Committee much more in the temper of the right hon. Member for South Dublin than in that of the Leader of the Opposition who had characterised the Bill as "carelessly drafted," as "Party legislation," as "a crude proposal," as "a strange fantastical measure," as "a most hopelessly foolish and illogical measure." He would ask hon. Gentlemen if they were to approach the debates on a Bill animated by the spirit of those words, would it not be absolutely impossible to come to any reasonable conclusion in regard to it? He submitted that in this country we were governed by discussion. The right hon. Gentleman's whole speech amounted to nothing else than abuse of the Bill. He had never condescended to treat the measure with the least respect or as one worthy of any reasonable consideration. He asked hon. Members to put themselves in the position of the Committee which had been appointed by the House to consider the measure and to amend it where desirable. They had to meet difficulties on the merits of the Bill. There was an avowed hostility to the methods of procedure in the Committee upstairs which was something not very far short of an intention to wreck the procedure on the Bill.

MR. WALTER LONG said that he entirely denied that the right hon. Gentleman had any right to assert that there was an avowed intention to wreck procedure.

MR. SINCLAIR said he would substitute for "avowed" the phrase "scarcely veiled." There was a further objection taken largely by Members of the Opposition, and that was to the institution of a Scottish Grand Committee, and not on acount of the merits of the Bill. On those two grounds they had to meet the most violent and bitter hostility during the discussions on the Bill. Speaking for himself, he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, who had always been fair, would admit that the earlier clauses of the Bill contained the principles of the measure on which there could be no substantial concession whatever made. The first four clauses contained the framework of the Bill, and there was no room for any substantial concessions in regard to them. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends took great exception to them. On the other hand, they received throughout the proceedings the hearty and enthusiastic support of a very large body of Scottish Members. It was proper that he should acknowledge now the gratitude that he himself felt and the Government owed to the great body of the Scottish Members who were acquainted with the facts and circumstances of Scottish life and opinion, who had exercised the greatest self-restraint and patience throughout all the proceedings carried on upstairs. Of course, the closure, whether by guillotine or by compartments, was always regretted both in the House or in Committee. It was not regretted more by the Opposition than by the Government. Everybody knew that the guillotine was a double-edged weapon and that its use must necessarily arouse embittered antagonism and that it *pro tanto* delayed the proceedings in legislation. With regard to the criticism which had been passed on himself that afternoon, he admitted that this was the first occasion on which it had fallen on him to pilot a Bill of this kind, or any other Bill, through Committee and that he had not as much experience as the right hon. Member for South Dublin. But he maintained that, such was the hostility of the

Opposition, if the closure had not been used they would have been discussing the Bill in Committee now. He would say further in regard to the closure that it was so used that with the exception of the point alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman, he challenged any Member of the Committee to point to a single important clause which was not discussed or the discussion of which was prevented by the use of the closure. In regard to the other point brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman, he would recollect the great length at which he went into the subject at the beginning of the clause and his reasons for rejecting it. He did not wish to prolong the discussion, and he saw no good reason for recrimination of any kind on these matters. For his part he had nothing to withdraw and nothing to apologise for in regard to what had fallen to him to do in the discharge of his duty. He only hoped that on future occasions in Committee the proceedings would be conducted with less friction than it had been his unhappy lot to experience on this occasion. He wished to take the opportunity of saying that he would be glad on the Report stage to confer with the right hon. Gentleman and his friends so as to facilitate the bringing forward of the subject on which he wished the House to come to a decision. It had been said that the closure had been used in order to prevent awkward questions and discussions. That was, he thought, an unworthy suggestion for which there was no foundation. He wished it could have been possible to have arranged for more discussion on the further stages of the Bill. He would only say one word more on the subject. The people affected by that afternoon's proceedings lived in a part of the United Kingdom for which the House was finding it increasingly difficult to provide time to legislate. The Scottish Grand Committee had been set up by the Government as a palliative for that evil condition of things. No adverse criticism on the conduct of the Scottish members in the Committee was valid, for, as a whole, they did everything they could to make it a working committee and to use it as an efficient and useful instrument for Scottish legislation. It was a serious and dangerous thing for the Opposition to paralyse this useful experiment in regard to Scotland. They might depend upon it that whilst Scotland was patient and forbearing and tolerant to a degree which he thought was not exceeded in any part of the United Kingdom, she had a right to her share of the time of Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin was under a total misapprehension if he imagined that there was not a very considerable and a very important body of opinion solidly in favour of this measure.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Not agricultural opinion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, agricultural opinion. There was a large body of opinion—ploughmen, farm servants, small holders, small farmers, and even a considerable number of large farmers—solidly in favour of the measure. The authentic voice of Scotland was to be found, not in resolutions of farmers' clubs and associations, but in the attitude of his hon. friends in that House. The measure was not a hasty proposal. It had been before the country now for more than twelve months, and there had been an opportunity for its discussion in every village in every county in Scotland. These being the facts, he contended that those who would dam up this channel of legislation and prevent the will of Scotland being realised in this and other measures were laying up for themselves a reckoning which would involve consequences much more serious than those which they feared.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) said he had not had the advantage of being a member of the Committee, but in some ways thatwas not a disadvantage, because he happened to represent a very large proportion of Members who were in the same position. They had heard from members of the Committee their views and recollections of what took place, and that was their only source of opinion. He confessed, if he were compelled to choose between the not always harmonious views given, he would certainly be inclined to accept the view of his right hon. friend. They had learned something during the course of the discussion, and particularly from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He had made one remark which must have struck the House as curious in view of the Motion they were discussing, when he told them that the country was governed by discussion. The whole gravamen of their charge was that no discussion was allowed. The right hon. Gentleman's remark was scarcely discreet. He had made it quite clear that his (the speaker's) right hon. friend was justified in saying that the discussions in the Committee were not carried out with that judicial regularity which they enjoyed in that House and which they would like to see in the Committees. He had made it perfectly evident that there was a vindictive spirit in the application of the closure. He had told them that he entered into the discussions believing that there was on the part of his right hon. friend and those who supported him a deliberate intention to wreck the Committee. That was a very easy charge to make, but was it not rather curious—to outsiders at any rate it seemed curious—that, if that was the case, no signs of that intention were to be found in another Committee—the Committee which considered the English Land Bill? He did not understand the compliment the right hon. Gentleman paid to the Member for South Dublin when he spoke of his moderation and courtesy on the Committee if there was this malignant purpose. They had heard and seen nothing of it on the Committee of the English Land Bill. He was compelled from from what the right hon. Gentleman himself had said and from his right hon. friend's remarks to the conclusion that the Secretary for Scotland went into the Committee with the deliberate intention of carrying matters through with a high hand. He had done that. They had already had evidence that before the Committee came to an end the force of public opinion which penetrated even to that dark recess produced an alteration in the procedure. There were some considerations which to him were important; and he thought they were absolutely justified in pressing the matter. The right hon. Gentleman made some remarks of a general character and spoke about the dangers that were likely to ensue from the conduct which he attributed to hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House. It struck him that there were other dangers not less certain, not less formidable. There were some 550 Members who, practically speaking, knew nothing of what had taken place in the Committee. He was astonished, in view of the speech of the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton, that the Bill should ever have been referred to a Committee at all, because it was perfectly idle to pretend that it was not a matter of the most vital importance. His right hon. friend had enumerated several points which, he believed, were all made more or less the subject of closure in Committee and all of which were of vital importance, not merely to Scottish Members interested in Scottish agriculture, but to every British citizen. There was the question of introducing that lamentable failure of the Irish land system into Scotland. In the second place, there was the question of substituting other legislation for the crofter legislation. In the third place there was the question of altering the whole agricultural arrangements of the country. His right hon. friend knew, nobody better, what was the advantage of the uniform authority of the Board of Agriculture, and he had given examples of what seemed to him the immense mischief which might be done by divorcing the two sections of that common body. What did any of them know with regard to any of these subjects? This debate was going to come to an end as a triumph of that policy of concealment by which alone legislation of this kind could be carried. They were supposed to be living in democratic times, and they were always having speeches made about the great body of public opinion. That, after all, was the tribunal to which they must all go, and by which they must be judged so far as their political short-comings or successes were concerned. But what were the Government doing? They were pledging the country, under a process absolutely novel, to a series of principles which so far as they were known at all, were condemned, not by the adherents of that Party, but by five-sixths of the people of England and Scotland. If they could make it perfectly clear to every Scottish and English elector that the lamentable history of the Irish land question was to be written on the Statute Book of Scotland, he ventured to say they would have a different class of support to that which the Secretary for Scotland had declared he possessed. They did not, however, know at all, and they could not know. The one and only legitimate way in which that knowledge could be brought before the public was by debates in that House. The debates had been going on in Committee for twenty-two Parliamentary days. Who was the wiser? They were told that fifteen English and Irish Members were allowed to participate in the discussions. He was glad they were there; they had at any rate some evidence of what took place. Otherwise it was a sealed book, and the book was to remain sealed. No one was to know what had taken place. There was another danger to which the Secretary for Scotland had not alluded, and which he thought was intensified by what had been said by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had talked about this cosmopolitan Committee. He thought the word cosmopolitan indicated citizens of the world, whereas the Committee was composed of citizens of the United Kingdom. He thought it was unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman should have treated the three sections of the United Kingdom as three separate powers. They had the argument used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and enforced by the Secretary for Scotland that the English Members had no business in this *galère* at all.

MR. ASQUITH said the right hon. Gentleman misunderstood him. He did not say anything of the kind.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he accepted the disclaimer of the right hon. Gentleman, but, if he did not mean that, they misunderstood a great deal of what he said. He wished to protest against any doctrine of that kind finding acceptance. The Secretary for Scotland had talked of the need for Scottish legislation, and had said that claims were made by Scotland upon Parliament for the fulfilment of her just demands. That was a very dangerous doctrine if carried too far. He had never heard it suggested, and he hoped it would be long before anyone did suggest, that Scottish Members should hold their tongues when English measures were discussed. Neither Scottish nor Irish Members ever observed that rule. It was most unfortunate that such a suggestion should have received support from the speech of the Secretary for Scotland. He protested, as a Member of the House who had never had, and never would have, any means of knowing what had taken place in Committee, against the doctrine of legislating in this hole-and-corner fashion. The Government were forcing the House to acquiesce in the registering of decrees, not in matters of technical detail, but in three or four grave matters of principle. It might be said that this was a Scottish question, but who would have thought a few years ago that it would be proposed to introduce the Irish system into Scotland? Having been introduced into Scotland, it was inevitable that it should come across the border, and he could hardly imagine any subject of greater importance to every class of the community than that such a question should be settled only with the fullest publicity and after the fullest discussion, and with the assent of the people generally concerned. The opportunity for a general discussion was now either to be taken away or curtailed.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY said he desired to move an Amendment to leave out "three" and insert "five" as the number of days to be allotted to the Report stage. Everybody who had listened to the debate would admit that that proposal was only reasonable. It was distinctly stated by a Member below the gangway who was a great authority upon Scottish land questions, that the clauses of this Bill contained greater principles than any Bill which had come before the House save the Home Rule Bill. Every Member who had spoken agreed that whether there had been a long discussion in Committee or not there was a necessity for a great deal more discussion before the Bill passed into law, and all the pledges given by the Government in Committee were in favour of full and free discussion in the House. He therefore thought they were right to claim full time when time was allotted as it was by the Government on this occasion. He quite admitted that if the Government would meet the Opposition in this way the time-table would have to be reconsidered, and he proposed that on the first day they should take the new clauses and Clause 1, which dealt with a very important principle. Then he thought anybody would admit that the definition of landowner and the establishment of the Land Court were sufficient to occupy another day, and a third day could be devoted to the question of the Agricultural Commission and the important matter raised by his right hon. friend the Member for South Dublin. They would in that way have these great principles discussed in the House. He begged to move.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said he seconded the Amendment in order to take up the challenge of the Lord Advocate, who had said there was nothing whatever of importance to discuss.

*MR. SPEAKER said that would be going back upon the main discussion and would not be in order.

MR. YOUNGER said he would endeavour to keep to the rules of order. Under this Resolution they had six clauses to discuss on the first day together with the new clauses, and it would be absolutely impossible to give adequate discussion even to Clauses 3 and 4, which were closured in Committee, and the new clauses in the time given. It was not, therefore, unreasonable to ask for further time to discuss the important question arising in those clauses, namely, the appointment of a Land Court, and he did not think the two extra days asked for was too much. It should not be forgotten that although there might be a body of opinion behind the Bill that body of opinion did not go the whole way in backing it up, and, having regard to the fact that the closure was moved on such huge blocks, he thought the Government had no right to allocate so short a time for Report.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out 'three' and insert 'five.'"—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Laurence Hardy.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said there was nothing to be said by him beyond a repetition of what the Government thought. They thought three days were enough. On the first day they had rather a formidable list of new clauses, which, at first sight, was somewhat alarming. Of the fifteen new clauses only one was put down by a supporter of the Bill and all the others by its opponents. On that ground, he thought he was justified in believing that they were not prepared with the simple desire to further the progress of the Bill. If the time at the disposal of the House for the discussion of the clauses of the Bill was shortened, the hon. Members who put these clauses down created that position.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the right hon. Gentleman might have devoted a little more attention to the appeal made by his hon. friend. His hon. friend had not protested against applying the closure at all, but had simply limited himself to the proposition that the time given by the Government was wholly inadequate. Let the right hon. Gentleman consider the first day's debate. He would not go into the importance of the six new clauses upon the Paper, two of which stood in the name of a supporter of the Government's policy in general, and in particular of this Bill; he would merely point out that whatever speed was shown in making progress, no Government had ever yet expected to get rid of the new clauses in a Bill without some hours discussion. Supposing the new clauses were disposed of in two and a half hours—there were fifteen of them, and it was sufficient to state that to show that two and a half hours was an absurd amount of time to give to the discussion of those clauses.—the six clauses were to be discussed from seven in the evening, and at a time when, ever since the alteration of the dinner hour rule, hon. Members, however ardent politicians they might be, and right hon. Gentlemen could not always be expected to be present; that was the time chosen for discussing the three most important clauses of the Bill. He said nothing about Clauses 1 or 2; but they had to consider Clause 3, which was a sixth part of the six clauses.

which were to be got through before half-past ten o'clock to-morrow night. Clause 3 established a Land Court for Scotland on the model of that which existed for Ireland. He could not imagine a question of greater importance from the point of view of general legislative principles, the future of agriculture in Scotland, or the interests of Great Britain than the establishment of a Land Court, and handing over to irresponsible Commissioners or Judges the whole industry of the country. It was the most tremendous thing they could do, and however bad it was, it was not a measure whose consequences could be limited to the particular area to which they chose to apply it. The establishment of Land Courts in Ireland had been followed by a tax on British credit of £150,000,000 sterling to do away with the effects of the system. If we adopted this policy in Scotland, the same results would follow for the taxpayer. Although the Bill related to Scotland, nobody supposed that such a precedent could be started in the northern portion of Great Britain without inevitable consequences in the southern portion of the island, if not as regarded land tenure, at least as regarded financial credit. Was it not ludicrous and preposterous that the House should be asked to discuss this matter in two or three hours as a sixth part of those clauses of the Bill which they were expected to get through on the first day before the fall of the guillotine at half-past ten o'clock? The Bill had never been discussed, except as to generalities on the Second Reading. Let them compare the demands made on previous occasions when the guillotine had been applied. The Education Bill of 1902 and the Licensing Bill of 1903, or any Bills they liked to choose in the ten years of the late Government, were measures in regard to which every opportunity was given to the House to consider the details. They had not as yet had five minutes to discuss in Committee or on the Report Stage the proposals of the present Bill; if they consulted Parliamentary history or precedents, if they considered that the real merits of the case might properly take weeks of discussion before the House accepted it, and if they compared what they might well ask for and what the Government proposed to give, he was utterly unable to believe that any man, who had a recollection of the traditions of that House even with the use of the guillotine by compartments, would not think that there never had been an outrage on the Members of the House comparable to the outrage which the Prime Minister was now perpetrating. He would not go through the other five clauses, though perhaps he ought to do so; but really the case was so overwhelming with regard to Clause 3, that he was not sure that he would materially strengthen it. There it stood, plainly and flagrantly, as the proposal which the Government intended to adopt. They were preparing to introduce for the first time into this island the greatest of all possible changes in land tenure, a change which no other country had ever been foolish enough to adopt, and which we had been foolish enough to adopt once and once only, with the result that we had ever since heartily repented of it. This was to be done without giving opportunity for anything more than a paltry debate, which would probably take place at the inconvenient hour of dinner. That meant, and could only mean, that in the view of the Government, the existence of a large majority was an excuse for carrying any measure, however preposterous, strange and revolutionary, not only without giving the opportunity of reversing or modifying their proposals, but without giving the Opposition a chance even of saying what they thought of them. He deeply regretted that the appeal of his hon. friend asking for the smallest possible concession to a most reasonable demand should have met with an unargued denial—an unsupported refusal—from the Minister in whose keeping the credit, honour, and freedom of that House properly resided.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said that as he understood the argument of the Prime Minister it was that fourteen out of the fifteen new clauses were hostile to the Bill, and had been, therefore, conceived in a spirit antagonistic to the measure. He did not know how the right hon. Gentleman arrived at that conclusion. He understood him to mean, if his words had any meaning, that because opponents of the Bill brought forward new clauses for the purpose of amending the Bill, and those clauses were hostile, then they were necessarily wrong and must not be discussed. That was exactly the attitude taken up in Committee by the Secretary for Scotland. He had always met their arguments by saying that the Bill was a good Bill, that the Opposition were hostile to it, and that, therefore, nothing further could be done except move the closure. He was sorry the Prime Minister was meeting their arguments in this manner, because it was not the way in which to accelerate progress. The question was whether five days were sufficient, and he thought they were not, and that more like ten days were required; but if the Prime Minister would accept five days, no doubt they, on that side of the House, would do their best to meet him and discuss those parts of the measure which were not discussed in Grand Committee. Might he point out that the first clause consisted of eighteen subsections, which in the course of ordinary drafting would make five or six clauses, while, the clause dealing with the Land Court contained twelve subsections—or thirty subsections between two clauses. He was astonished at the moderation of his hon. friend in asking for only five days, and he was sure that on further consideration the Prime Minister and the Secretary for Scotland would accept the Amendment to insert "five" days instead of "three."

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 175; Noes, 59. (Division List No. 372.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie

Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)

Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J.D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, RtHon.SirJohnH.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford, East)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, SirEdward (Salisbury)
Thomson, W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Whitbread, Howard
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

LORD R. CECIL moved an Amendment providing that none of the allotted days should be a Friday or a Saturday. He could not believe that the Government proposed to take any one of the three allotted days either on a Friday or a Saturday which would only give them five hours. He begged to move.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded. When this Bill was before the Committee they were deprived of the services of hon. Members who were lawyers, and if the Report stage was taken on a Friday those hon. Members would still be engaged in the Courts. [AN HON. MEMBER: It is the Long Vacation.] He was glad that on the Report stage they would be favoured with the presence of lawyers. Many hon. Members wished to go away at five o'clock on Fridays.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the word 'day,' to insert the words 'none of which shall be a Friday or a Saturday.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he had already informed the House that the intention of the Government was to take the Report stage of this Bill on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. It was therefore unnecessary to provide that none of those days should be a Friday or Saturday, and there was no necessity for the Amendment. He quite agreed that Friday should not be one of the allotted days for the Report stage.

LORD R. CECIL said the only reason why this Amendment was necessary was that the Government might find themselves unable to take the Report stage on the days mentioned. The Prime Minister or the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill might be ill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the noble Lord had given a very unpleasant reason. He had already stated that the Report stage would be taken on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday.

Question put, and negatived.

MR. ABEL SMITH (Hertfordshire, Hertford) moved an Amendment to provide that only the new clauses, and Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill, should be disposed of on the first allotted day. What had been said to-day on behalf of the Government was all based on the assumption that the clauses were thoroughly discussed in Committee. He would remind the Prime Minister that Clauses 2 and 3 were passed without any discussion at all. It was too much to ask the House to dispose of the new clauses, and also the first six clauses of the Bill, on one day. The first clause was most difficult to understand, and they had never been able to get an explanation of it. It extended the provisions of the Crofters Act and must have a far-reaching effect. The second clause laid down who were to be landholders. The third clause establishing a Land Court for Scotland was most revolutionary. The fourth clause proposed to establish Agricultural Commissioners for Scotland who were to carry on the work under the direction of the Land Court. He thought the Prime Minister and the Secretary for Scotland would admit that it was too much to ask the House to deal with these matters on one day. He submitted also that the new clauses were of a varied character and raised points of importance which would necessarily occupy some time.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 3, to leave out the words "1 to 6,' and to insert the words '1 and 2.' "—(*Mr. Abel Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'to 6' stand part of the Question."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that the Government considered the apportionment of time proposed in the Resolution as the fairest that could be made, but they would agree to the Amendment if the Opposition would consent to the consequential Amendments. Not more than three days could be given altogether, and if one were unloaded the others must be overloaded.

MR. WALTER LONG said he entirely approved of the proposal of his hon. friend. He gathered from what the Prime Minister said that if only the new clauses and Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill were taken on the first day, it would be necessary to put Clause 3 into the next group, which contained matters of very great controversy. It was difficult to see how the Opposition could accept in full the suggestion of the Prime Minister that, if the Amendment were agreed to, the consequential Amendments should also be agreed to. That would mean that, besides the new clauses, eleven clauses of the Bill would have to be dealt with on the second day. That seemed to be a very large demand to make as the result of accepting the Amendment of his hon. friend. While Clause 2 was very important, Clauses 3 and 5 were also important, and he could not agree to the suggestion that they should form part of a group of eleven to be discussed on the second day.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he was anxious that the two sides of the House should not work at cross purposes. He wished it to be understood that the apportionment of the time which the Government proposed in the Motion was, in their opinion, the fairest in the circumstances. He only suggested that, if it was agreeable to the right hon. Gentleman and his friends, the Government were willing to accept the Amendment if Clauses 3 to 6 were included in the second day's group.

Amendment negatived.

LORD R. CECIL moved an Amendment to provide that on the first day the new clauses should be disposed of by six o'clock, Clause 1 by seven o'clock, Clause 2 by eight o'clock, Clause 3 by nine o'clock, Clause 4 by ten o'clock, Clause 5 by eleven o'clock, and Clause 6 by midnight. He said one of the great objections to proceeding by the guillotine was the enormous addition it gave to the powers of the Government of the day. It enabled them, consciously or unconsciously, so to arrange their business that practically they could avoid discussion on any particular portion of a Bill. It seemed to him a serious matter in connection with the present position of political affairs that there was a tendency for more and more power to drift into the hands of the Cabinet. If that went on, the House of Commons would become a less and less important assembly, and it would be more difficult to get men of independence to enter the House. This was not a mere whim in this particular case. It was shown in the debate the other day which took place at a very unseasonable hour on the Lords' Amendments to the Army Bill. The hon. Member for Leicester in that case pointed out that the provision in the Bill which enabled the County Associations to assist rifle clubs had never been really submitted for discussion in the House. That clause fell under the guillotine, and, therefore, the Labour Members were unable to express and enforce their views. He did not think that could be altogether avoided by any arrangement once the guillotine was established. They must modify it to some extent by splitting up a Bill in the smallest number of sections, so that there would be power to submit the Amendments on each particular section to the decision of the House. His proposal was that instead of dividing the Bill into groups of one day it should be divided into groups of one hour—two hours for new clauses and an hour each for other clauses. The only difference as to time would be that the House would require to sit till midnight on this Bill instead of to half-past ten o'clock, which surely would not be an undue demand on hon. Members. The effect of his Amendment would be that in each particular group if objection was strongly felt to one clause it could be forced upon the attention of the Government and command the consideration of the House. His scheme was designed to make the closure procedure a little less oppressive than it admittedly was to private Members.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had much pleasure in seconding the Motion. He thought there was considerable force in the noble Lord's argument, that the Government by the methods now adopted were enabled o remove awkward questions from the consideration of the House. At the same time he would point out to his noble friend that although his Amendment was a step in the right direction it would not altogether carry out his object. An hour was not a very long time to discuss an important Amendment. The House took different views as to what was an important Amendment. For instance, what he might consider an important Amendment the Prime Minister would not. Therefore, to start with, it would be rather difficult in one hour to pick out the Amendment round which the principal discussion should be taken. The proposal of his noble friend was, however, better than that of the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 5, after the word 'day,' to insert the words, 'Provided that the new clauses shall be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion by 6 p.m., Clause 1 by 7 p.m., Clause 2 by 8 p.m., Clause 3 by 9 p.m., Clause 4 by 10 p.m., Clause 5 by 11 p.m., and Clause 6 by midnight.'"—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR H. CAMBPELL-BANNERMAN said that the noble Lord had drawn a picture, fortunately a short one, of the decay of Parliament, and had gone on in a characteristic way to say that we should discourage men of independent mind and public spirit from coming into the House under the new rules. But the noble Lord's cure was to make debate even more mechanical than would be the case under the Government arrangement. It would be to make closure by compartment within a compartment. The noble Lord had contended that there should be an opportunity of discussing important Amendments, but as the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London admitted, they all differed as to what might constitute an important Amendment. The noble Lord's proposal would be carrying guillotine by compartment rules almost to an absurd extreme. He did not think a remedy for the evils from which they suffered was to be found in making more mechanical rules, but rather in the other direction.

MR. ABEL SMITH said that this was a choice of evils. There was one aspect of the question which had not been touched upon, and that was that the Government plan did not secure full consideration of any single line: whereas, his noble friend's proposal had at least this merit, that it secured some consideration for each of the clauses.

Mr. CHAPLIN (Surrey, Wimbledon) pointed out that it might happen that a most important clause would be at the end of one of the compartments. Under the proposal of the Government there would be no discussion whatever on that clause. If the Amendment of the noble Lord were agreed to, however, it would at least ensure that such a clause would not be passed over without some discussion, though he admitted that it could not be adequate or satisfactory.

Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that Clause 1, although short, brought in an enormous amount of legislation by reference, and that was a calamity which had to be discussed at full length. As to Clause 2, a very importaint Amendment had been placed upon the Paper by a Ministerialist, and it would be a very serious thing if that Amendment were not considered. Clause 3 had practically not been discussed at all, while of Clause 4, which consisted of two whole pages of the Bill, only twelve or fourteen lines had been discussed in Committee. A shorter time might be taken to Clauses 5 and 6, in order to secure some time to discuss Clauses 3 and 4. That was absolutely essential.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that they had only to look at his noble friend's Amendment to see how ludicrous it made the whole Resolution. When they came to Clause 3 they would have to begin the discussion of the new Land Court, and the Irish system of divided ownership. Was it not ludicrous that sixteen new clauses and six clauses of the Bill should be discussed between four o'clock and half-past ten? Could the Government suggest a better arrangement than that of his noble friend?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is in your power to use the time if you like.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he begged the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that no Party in the House was in that perfect drill which he imagined, or that every Member was going to regulate his speech to suit some general scheme which had not yet been passed. The proposal of his noble friend ensured that something, it might be only one speech, or part of a speech, but still something, would be said about each one of the clauses. Everybody knew that that would not happen otherwise. He thought it would be well that the House should face the real truth, and see in its naked actuality the plan which the Government were forcing upon them It was for that reason that he would support the Amendment of his noble friend.

***Mr. LEIF JONES** (Westmoreland, Appleby) said he had never yet voted, and, so far as he could see, he never would vote, for a closure by compartment Resolution for the reason that such Resolution always failed to secure the discussion of important points. He admitted that the noble Lord's Amendment was too mechanical, but it secured that no clause should be passed through the House wholly undiscussed, and for that reason it was his intention to go into the lobby with the noble Lord.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 373.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon Henry

Mr. Abel Smith

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Glover, Thomas
Gordon, J.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Grady, J.
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Abel Smith.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness-sh
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradford.
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Waring, Walter

Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Main Question again proposed.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 177; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 374.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. E.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furnes)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nnueaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingon
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES,—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 176 ; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 375.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)

Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor).
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall).
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Ordered, That the Report Stage of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill be brought to a conclusion in three allotted days; and—

(*a*) That the new clauses and Clauses 1 to 6 of the Bill be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; and

(*b*) That Clauses 7 to 15 of the Bill (if and so far as not previously disposed of) be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; and

(*c*) That the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage of the Bill to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded with on the third allotted day and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

Any day on which the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this order.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, or if that day is a Friday at

5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any new clauses or Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other clauses or Amendments), and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8 15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order "Time for taking Private Business," be taken immediately after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order "Sittings of the House."

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday or Saturday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

After the passing of this order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to recommit the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate.

NON-PROVIDED SCHOOLS IN MERIONETHSHIRE—TEACHERS' SALARIES (MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT).

LORD R. CECIL said the matter he desired to bring to the attention of the House by the process of moving the adjournment was one of some considerable importance and related to the action taken by the local education authority in the county of Merioneth with regard to the salaries of the teachers in non-provided schools. Hon. Members would remember that as soon as the Education Act of 1902 was passed a considerable agitation was aroused in Wales, largely by Members of the present Government, the object of which was to bring about what was commonly called the Welsh revolt. The general purport of the movement in the first instance was to decline to work the Act altogether, but that was soon abandoned because some of the chief movers in the revolt accepted places of profit for the administration of the Act. The next phase of the revolt consisted of depriving the voluntary schools of assistance out of the rates. No one who watched what took place could doubt that the real object underlying all was to injure the Church of England. He knew that that was denied, but looking at the facts of the case he had very little doubt that that was the real object. The methods by which this was sought to be carried out were various. One was to understaff the voluntary schools.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): That is not true.

LORD R. CECIL: The hon. Member, with scant courtesy, said that was not true.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES: True in a single instance only, but not generally.

LORD R. CECIL said he had brought cases to the notice of the House. Another method was to underpay the teachers in Church schools. They were not only paid at very much lower rates than prevailed for similar teachers in the council schools.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said he understood that the noble Lord had risen to draw attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance. He wished to know if the hon. Member was in order in going into the whole history of this question.

Lord R. CECIL said he was only briefly discussing the subject. In this movement the county of Merioneth had always taken a very active share, and he dared say was very proud of it. They had been supported by conferences and by public bodies, to whom the President of the Board of Trade had made valuable and very strong speeches. He remembered one in 1905, and he thought the President of the Board of Trade had taken his part in stirring up the people of Merioneth to resist as far as possible the enforcement of the law.

Mr. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): The President of the Board of Trade has never been in Merioneth.

Lord R. CECIL said he did not say that the right hon. Gentleman had been in Merioneth, but he had spoken at other places. The teachers of voluntary schools were entitled to receive their quarter's salary on the 1st July, or shortly after the 1st July. So were the teachers in the council schools. The teachers in the council schools had all been paid, every one of them, he believed, by the 12th July. The teachers in the voluntary schools had not been paid. There were twenty-one voluntary schools in Merioneth, employing fifty or sixty teachers. Not one of those teachers had received a penny of salary up to the present time from the local authority. He asked the House to consider what that meant to men in this walk of life. Most of them were deprived of the opportunity of taking a holiday at all. Many of them had suffered more serious disadvantages. Obviously the case was not so much one of paying them out of the rates as of delaying payment. It was an organised delay of payment to the voluntary teachers of their salaries. It had been done over and over again since 1904, and this was a particularly complete and flagrant case. It was not an isolated question of administration; it was a deliberate deprivation of these very poor men and women of the means they would otherwise have of taking the very necessary holiday which their work allowed them. One teacher, by this action of the local authority, had been prevented from paying his insurance premium and keeping up his insurance. In another case—he admitted that it was a mere accident that it should be so—the teacher had a bedridden wife; and of course the injury fell far more on the invalid than on the healthy members of the household. Admittedly the whole defence of this action was the injury which it would do to denominational schools. He did not know whether hon. Gentlemen realised what this proceeding of the local authority meant. They were inflicting gross injustice and hardship on men and women who had done no wrong at all, in order to further an object with which, whether worthy or unworthy, these people had no concern. He did not think it was recognised by the people who supported these lawless proceedings that it was always the poorest and weakest who suffered. Proceedings of this sort were directed against rich corporations and political organisations. The rich and powerful corporations were wholly unaffected, and the political organisations gained rather than lost. The people who suffered were the poor men and women who were deprived of their salaries. One of the teachers had written to him, he must say with admirable self-restraint. He said—

> "I think it very hard indeed, after such hard work, for the money to be withheld in Party spite, to prevent teachers having a holiday and paying important bills."

That seemed to him a very serious indictment. The remedy was exceedingly simple. It was provided by Parliament and could be employed by the President of the Board of Education without the least difficulty. He referred to the Defaulting Authorities Act. It provided that the Board at Whitehall might repay the managers the expenses which the local authorities ought to have met. It was true that the managers would have to pay the teachers first out of their own pockets, but the President of the Board of Education had only to send a circular to the managers of the twenty-one schools telling them that the money would be repaid to them, and nobody could doubt that within a week every voluntary school teacher who had been deprived of his salary would be paid. Many of these managers were nearly as poor as the teachers themselves, and to ask them to run the risk of a long lawsuit with the local education authority without being assured beforehand of the support of the Central Department was to ask them to do something which was utterly unreasonable. He did not think they would be discharging their public duty if they fell in with any such proposal. The plan which he suggested would do justice and hurt no one, except that it would, no doubt, injure the effective carrying out of this mean and paltry form of persecution. He was asking the right hon. Gentleman to do that which was very much against human nature, for the President of the Board of Education had spent many hours in the last Parliament in denouncing this Act. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] He observed that hon. Members opposite cheered this statement. He confessed that in view of recent history he was amazed at those cheers. If hon. and right hon. Gentlemen took the trouble to recall some of the Bills at the present moment before Parliament, they would remember that one contained powers to coerce local authorities far more extensive than anything contained in the Defaulting Authorities Act. It contained powers to compel county councils to undertake experiments in land culture which they did not desire to do, and then compelled them to pay the expenses of that culture out of the rates rather than out of the taxes. The same policy had been adopted in connection with the Labourers (Ireland) Act last year. But he had a more definite statement by the Prime Minister, who said in reference to the question of unemployment, as long ago as 1904—

> "While the central authority should give latitude to local bodies, it ought to have large powers of compelling local authorities to do their duty."

The policy of the Defaulting Authorities Act had been put into force over and over again by the Liberal Party. The only possible reason for declining to enforce it now was the recollection of the irresponsible utterances of Gentlemen who now sat on the Treasury Bench. At any rate, whether that was the reason or not, he was quite certain that he had the concurrence, in their own minds, of nine-tenths of the people who heard him. This scandal, this attempt maliciously to persecute voluntary school teachers who had committed no fault whatever, who had stuck to their duty and had taught the children entrusted to their care to the best of their ability, must be put a stop to. He was quite confident that he carried with him the opinion or judgment of practically the whole House. He did not believe that if they searched through the last fifty or one hundred years they would find a case comparable to that which he was putting before the House. They were told that it was members of the Church of England who were intolerant. In the greater proportion of the local authorities members of the Church of England were in an enormously overwhelming majority. ["No."] It was so. Could hon. Members opposite quote a single instance of treatment even remotely resembling that which had been meted out to the teachers in this case, in any Wesleyan or other school? He knew they could not. If they took action of the kind to which he now drew attention there would be such a storm among hon. Gentlemen opposite that a Motion for adjournment would be regarded as a poor and inadequate remedy. This was a course of intolerance and bigotry; it was very mean and cowardly besides, and ought to be put a stop to directly by the Central Government. It was this spirit of intolerance and bigotry which made the settlement of the education question so difficult, if not impossible. Until the Welsh authorities, under the leadership and instigation of the right hon. Gentleman and others, abandoned this kind of policy, he was perfectly certain that whether, as the right hon. Gentleman was good enough to say a few days ago, they came with the sword or in peace, they would not settle the education question, whatever legislation they passed. A stop must be put to this action, and put with a very strong hand, in the interests of education and of peace, and, above all, in the interests of the teachers and of the children they taught. He begged to move.

*MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash), in seconding the Motion, said it seemed to him that this case was of a gross and marked kind, directed against a class who were least able to defend themselves. It was a striking case in which the Government ought to try to do justice to those who were unable to protect themselves against a strong and powerful local authority. He was surprised that none of the hon. Members below the gangway were supporting this Motion, because it was a case of protecting the weak against the strong. Under the Act of 1902 it was the duty of the Board of Education to protect the teachers from oppression of every kind. The President of the Board of Education seemed to be throwing away his power of seeing fair-play between the teachers and the local authority. This system of using the teachers in a political campaign was no new matter; it had been tried in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Upon a previous occasion the present Chief Secretary for Ireland when he was at the head of the Board of Education insisted upon the law being carried out. What made the present instance more important was that this was not the first time this sort of thing had occurred under the administration of the present President of the Board of Education. In a case which occurred at Royston in the West Riding, of Yorkshire, the right hon. Gentleman proved that he was not prepared to stand up for the teacher against the local authority.

MR. McKENNA: Nonsense.

*MR. LANE-FOX said he was not aware what were the canons of civility on the Treasury Bench; but was it usual for a Minister of the Crown to interrupt a speaker with the word "Nonsense"?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr. EMMOTT) said he did not hear who used the expression, but he must point out that these constant interruptions tended to disturb and prolong the debate.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) pointed out that the expression fell from the Minister for Education, and he trusted Mr. Deputy-Speaker would ask the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw it.

MR. McKENNA: May I ask whether, when an hon. Gentleman charges me with refusing to fulfil my duty in protecting the weak against the strong, I am in order in informing the hon. Gentleman that he is talking nonsense?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I certainly do not think that "nonsense" is a phrase that ought to be used. [Cries of "Withdraw."]

MR. McKENNA: In deference to your ruling, sir, I withdraw.

*MR. LANE-FOX said that in the case he had mentioned the action of the right hon. Gentleman justified him in saying that they had every reason not to trust him in the matter because he did not fulfil his responsibility and failed to protect a man who required his protection. [Cries of "Order, order."]

MR. LEIF JONES asked if the hon. Member was in order in making a charge which it was impossible for the Minister for Education to reply to because it would not be in order.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I confess that I do not see the relevancy of this particular matter. I must remind the hon. Member that he must keep within the terms of the Motion.

MR. LYTTELTON asked if it would not be in order to show that this was part of a system and that there had been other instances.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I cannot see that other instances even of a like kind arise on this Motion which is a Motion for the adjournment of the House to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz.,—the case of Merionethshire. The debate must be confined to the case of the Merionethshire teachers, which is the "definite matter of urgent public importance" to which attention is now being called.

MR. LYTTELTON said that if it could be shown that there had been other instances surely that was relevant.

MR. McKENNA said the case to which the hon. Member was referring was not a similar case at all, but a totally different one.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is quite clear that the hon. Member cannot discuss other cases in detail. This debate ought to be confined to the question on which leave of the House was granted, and my ruling is that the discussion must be confined to that.

*MR LANE-FOX said he had no intention of going into the case he had alluded to in detail, and he only mentioned it as an illustration. When this question was raised a short time ago the right hon. Gentleman sheltered himself behind the plea that the teachers could sue the managers. Did not the words "maintain and keep efficient" put the whole responsibility upon the local educational authority? There was another reason why they had strong grounds for not having absolute faith in the Board of Education, and that was the undoubted bias of Mr. Davies, the Superintendent of the Welsh Department of the Board of Education, in regard to his post before he was appointed. That was why the managers would be unable to have confidence in the impartiality of the Board in this case. Where a clear case of oppression of the teachers was proved the House ought to back up the managers. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he was prepared to do as much as the Member for Oxford University to secure fair play for the teacher, and he had given that deliberate pledge to the House. What the late Government did in similar cases was to put into effect the Defaulting Authorities Act, and that was what they asked the right hon. Gentleman to do now. All the President of the Board of Education had to do was to send a circular round to the managers letting them know that if they incurred this expenditure they would be backed up by the Government, and there was no doubt that then the way would be clear, and the teachers' salaries would be paid. The reason why they insisted upon immediate action was that this was part of what was known as the Welsh revolt, and nobody would attempt to deny that revolt had been largely the practice in Wales. He thought he could prove why it was necessary that hon. Gentlemen should act speedily. The whole essence of the revolt he had alluded to was that there should be a series of protracted delays.

MR. McKENNA asked if the hon. Member was in order in proceeding to enter into this question, because he would not have an opportunity of answering him. [OPPOSITION cries of "Why not?"]

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question of the Welsh revolt is not the definite matter of urgent public importance raised in the Motion, and therefore it is not in order.

LORD R. CECIL asked if his hon. friend would be in order if he dealt with any topic which might affect the necessity for this Motion.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I did not interrupt the hon. Member when he merely said that this was part of the Welsh revolt, but he was proceeding to go into the tendencies of that revolt and that is not in order. The discussion must be confined to the definite matter of urgent public importance.

*MR. LANE-FOX said what he was proposing to go into was that the essence of the Welsh revolt was systematic delay, and therefore this case under discussion was the beginning of a series of delays in Merionethshire.

*MR. DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: If this case is the beginning of a series, then this one case may be and is a definite matter of urgent public importance, but the remainder of the series cannot be discussed. They can be neither definite nor urgent, for they have not occurred.

*MR. LANE-FOX said this case was one in which the teachers really wanted support and help. He appealed to the President of the Board of Education as a man of fairness to see that justice was dealt out as between these teachers and the local education authority. He thought the urgency of the matter fully justified his hon. friend in bringing it before the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Lord Robert Cecil.*)

Mr. McKENNA said he did not remember a case in which the adjournment of the House had been moved on such flimsy grounds. He was not speaking now of the hardship of the teachers, which he admitted had been serious, nor of the desire which everybody entertained that the hardship should be put an end to, but he was speaking of the charge against the Government of having failed to do their duty. Neither the noble Lord nor the hon. Member who seconded the Motion had the faintest suggestion to make as to what the Government could legally have done under existing circumstances. The teachers had not been paid their salaries which were due on the 1st of July. As the facts stood, there were only two remedies open to them. The first was for the teachers to sue the managers, who could then have joined the local authority as defendants. Thus speedy judgment could have been obtained in the county courts.

Lord R. CECIL indicated dissent.

Mr. McKENNA said the noble Lord shook his head. He did not know that the noble Lord intended to dispute the accuracy of what he had said.

Lord R. CECIL said he did. The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that it would have been open to the local authority to put every possible obstacle in the way of a speedy judgment.

Mr. McKENNA said the noble Lord was apparently not familiar with the procedure. What obstacle could the local authority put in the way of the county court procedure? By this time the teachers in every case would have obtained judgment. The Government were in no wise responsible for the neglect of this remedy. The second remedy open was that the Government could have considered the propriety of proceeding against the local authority by *mandamus*. Here he must remind the House that what the noble Lord had really complained of was not the action of the Government, but the Act of 1902, which was responsible for this state of things. Did the noble Lord suggest that if the Government had proceeded by *mandamus* in the month of July that would have been of the faintest advantage to the teachers? That would have been a case in which the local education authority could have caused an infinite amount of delay. And his hon. friend the Attorney-General reminded him that he could not have got even a *mandamus* to pay money. Would the noble Lord tell him what other procedure was open to the Government? The noble Lord relied on the Act of 1904. He had not read that Act.

Lord R. CECIL: Oh, yes, I have.

Mr. McKENNA said he could not understand how the noble Lord, having read that Act, could have made the speech he had made. The Act said that the Board of Education might, if they were satisfied that it was expedient to do so on account of any default of the local authority in the performance of their duties, if it appeared that the managers of a school had for the purpose of maintaining and keeping the school efficient incurred any expense for which provision had been made by the local education authority, pay to the managers such amount of expenditure as in the opinion of the Board was properly incurred. He could assure the noble Lord that it did not appear to them that the managers of any school had for the purpose of maintaining and keeping the school efficient incurred any expense. It was, on the contrary, well within the knowledge of the Board that the managers had not incurred any expense. He had to be satisfied that the managers had incurred expense before he began to consider whether it was expedient to act. He had no power to issue a circular. He had no statutory power to give a guarantee beforehand as to the payment of public money to the managers. The method of the Board of Education at present was to proceed according to the law. The noble Lord had been brought up in a different school. He had no power to consider a refund of any sums of money until the managers had themselves paid the money. Where had the Government failed to act? The House would be surprised to hear, notwithstanding the moving tale of a bedridden wife, and a teacher prevented from paying his insurance, that, as a matter of fact, through the action of the National Union of Teachers the salaries of the teachers had been paid.

LORD R. CECIL said the hon. Gentleman was entirely mistaken. Out of fifty or sixty teachers not more than twelve to fifteen were members of the National Union, and they had only received two-thirds of their salary.

MR. McKENNA regretted to hear that so small a number were members of the National Union. He had been informed that, as a matter of fact, the teachers were paid. Everybody deplored that any teacher should suffer, but he appealed to the House whether the obvious and appropriate remedy was not that the teachers should sue the managers, who could exercise their right of joining the local authority as co-defendants.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) thought the hon. Gentleman took a singular view of his functions. These teachers' salaries were in arrear. Their holidays were approaching, if they had not already begun. They had no money with which to pay their more immediate bills. That money was unlawfully withheld by the local education authority, whose duty it was to maintain the schools and to pay the teachers. The teacher wanted his money and the right hon. Gentleman offered him a lawsuit, and that when he had the remedy in his own hands and could secure the payment of the salaries at once. Then he mentioned the alternative of a *mandamus*; but the result of proceeding in that way would probably be that for about a year and a half the teacher would have to go without his salary. What were the means the right hon. Gentleman had under the Defaulting Authorities Act? If the Board of Education were informed that the teachers were not paid they should write to the local education authority and invite their observations. If they got unsatisfactory observations they should write to the managers to ask whether the salaries had been earned and were unpaid. That was a form with which the right hon. Gentleman ought to be familiar by this time. The Board should then write again to the education authority and say, "If you do not do what you are bound to do, we shall enable the managers to pay, and the money will be deducted from your Parliamentary grant." If they got an unsatisfactory answer, all they had to do was to say to the managers, "You can pay the teachers and we shall regard that payment as a payment for which provision should be made by the local authority, and we shall pay you when the time comes." That was the law, and it had been put in practice without question and with most satisfactory results. So much for the unfortunate incapacity of the right hon. Gentleman to do what was right. He had told the House that he was awaiting a reply from the local authority. The President of the Board of Trade in one of his speeches in the early days of the Welsh Revolt had said that one weapon the local education authority could use with effect was delay. He described how the voluntary schools could be injured by withholding the teachers' salaries, by under-staffing, or in various other ways in which an ingenious local authority could persecute them; and he pointed out that the Board of Education would communicate with the local authority and they would give an assurance that the matter would be fully considered at the next meeting, that care should be taken as to the position of the matter on the agenda, and that by the time it was reached the council would be weary, the last trains would be leaving, and the matter would be postponed to a more convenient season. Meanwhile the voluntary school would undergo, as the right hon. Gentleman hoped, a gradual process of starvation. So much for the latitude of communication which the President of the Board of Education thought was necessary before he could put into operation the Defaulting Authorities Act, and do common justice to the teachers in these voluntary schools. It is not as if this was a solitary instance. It was part of a scheme of oppression by the local educational authorities. This was not the first but the third or fourth time that the voluntary school teachers had had their salaries withheld till the quarter after the holidays.

MR. McKENNA said there was delay in 1905.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he believed that there was delay in that year, but it did not come to his knowledge, or he would have come to the rescue, as in the case of Montgomeryshire, and with good effect. There was no delay or *laches* on his part; it was mere want of information.

MR. MCKENNA: It happened before.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he did not think so. The county of Merionethshire was the first local education authority in which the Defaulting Authorities Act was put into operation, but on other grounds. The question was urgent and important because it was an illustration of the attitude of the Board of Education on these matters. Wherever a voluntary school made any lapse in the exact requirements of the Board of Education, every opportunity was taken to destroy it. [AN HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches: Hear, hear!] The hon. Gentlemen said "Hear, hear," and that was the embodiment of the Nonconformist conscience. Did the hon. Member desire that every advantage should be given to the county council schools and that no relief should be given to the voluntary schools? [AN HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches: Denominational schools; there are no voluntary schools.] At any rate, this illustrated the attitude of the Board of Education. In the case of a school near Halifax every arrangement had been made for carrying out necessary repairs. The Education Bill of last year threw into suspense every matter of that nature. But at the beginning of this year the managers were prepared to carry out the repairs, and the Board of Education said that the time had passed and the school was ruled out.

MR. LLEWELYN WILLIAMS (Carmarthen District) asked whether the hon. Baronet was in order in referring to other schools.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said he did not see that the hon. Baronet's argument referring to the action of other local authorities was relevant. The action of the Board of Education in reference to repairs o! a school not even in Merionethshire was clearly outside the definite case of the Merionethshire teachers.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that that was an illustration of the action of the Board of Education in failing to secure justice being done to the teachers of denominational schools, while it was in their power to see that justice was done.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said he thought the hon. Baronet must feel that his remarks did not come within the scope of the Motion, which referred to a matter of definite urgency and public importance—the non-payment of the teachers in certain schools in Merionethshire.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he would not say one word more as to the stringency with which rules were enforced on voluntary schools, but he would add a few words as to the deplorable laxity with which the President of the Board exercised his powers in enforcing the law as regarded the duty of the county councils schools. The right hon. Gentleman ought to insist upon the county council doing its duty to the voluntary schools. If there was a body of men who deserved well of the State it was the teachers in the elementary schools. Their holidays were, moreover, especially necessary to enable them to bring back freshness of mind to the discharge of their duties. Yet here was a body of men who were denied the enjoyment of their holidays for no other reason than that they belonged to denominational and voluntary schools, whereas the teachers in other schools got their salaries and their holidays. The Board of Education would not raise a hand to secure that both classes of teachers should be treated in the same way. The business of a Government Department in these matters was to interpret the law strictly and equally between all parties and creeds. That was the line which, in his humble way, he had endeavoured to take, and that was the line which he desired to see carried out now. It would be very unfortunate if in departmental administration a difference were made between the supporters of the Government and their political opponents, and least of all in matters which concerned the education of the children. Surely those small animosities which existed against the voluntary schools should not be exhibited to the detriment of the teachers who had served the State so well, and which would be reflected on the children who if the teachers suffered would not be so well taught. He thought it was not foreign to the Motion to call attention to the partiality of the Board of Education and its lack of judicial power in dealing with two different parties of religious teachers, or to lament that the President of the Board of Education should have taken so narrow—he might almost say so trivial—a view of his own responsibilities as to raise specious objections and technical points when the remedy was ready to his hand, and he had only to employ it, and the teachers would be paid.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire) said that he was as earnest a Churchman as the noble Lord himself, and had been returned unopposed by the most nonconformist county in Great Britain. There was, accordingly, no question of persecuting church schools in this matter. The Merionethshire Council were fighting for a principle. When the Act of 1902 was passed the then county council passed a resolution that they would not levy a rate for the maintenance of non-provided schools unless they had complete control and management. The present county council had followed and re-affirmed that principle, with the consequence that the county of Merionethshire had never spent any of the money derived from the rates on the maintenance of those non-provided schools. They kept them going, however, as long as they could, the grants they had earned being used for this purpose. They had come to an end of their resources, and there was nothing else left for the county council to do than to refuse to pay the salaries of the teachers. They could not do otherwise without violating their conscientious convictions and breaking the pledges they had given to the ratepayers. That was the position, and he ventured to say that if the Bill of last year had been passed their troubles would have been at an end. They were disappointed in that, and he very much regretted that they were constrained to continue the fight for conscience, and that the Government had been caused any difficulty by their attitude. The action of the county council had had the excellent result, at any rate, of preventing 90 per cent. of the ratepayers of Merionethshire from being forced to become passive resisters. He regretted the unfortunate position in which the teachers were placed, but when all was said and done it was very largely their own fault. These people knew all along that this resolution had been passed by the county council, and that the county council had no money except the grants. The best course of procedure which the teachers could have taken would have been to resign. The schools would then have been closed, and after a time taken over by the local authority, when these very teachers would have been re-engaged at largely increased salaries and under much better masters.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) said that the defence made by the hon. Member of this iniquitous action of the county council was simply that it was defying the law. He denied that the county council were justified in breaking the law. If they were going to be told that breaches of the law of this character were to be condoned because a fight for conscience was in progress, all he could say was that, when this Government went out of office, it was extremely likely that masses of people would have cause for a good many fights for conscience of this kind. He did not pretend to say that would be justifiable, but it was very much to the point to say that what the hon. Gentleman said was perfectly unjustifiable. He was amazed that a defence of this kind was put forward. The President of the Board of Education let them understand it was his duty to do nothing. He evidently had an extreme reluctance to deal with the matter at all. That had been a characteristic of his whole conduct. When they questioned him on Thursday he told them that the Act of 1902 was somewhat obscure as to the powers of the Board of Education and of the local education authority in relation to certain matters, of which this was one, and he was not quite certain, he added, what the powers were in this respect. He supposed he could so far congratulate him that between Thursday and now he had at any rate discovered what possible remedies there were and how far he would be disposed to apply them. They asked whether he would do his utmost to get the salaries paid at once, and they had not got an answer. They did not yet know clearly whether or not he was going to do his best to get the salaries paid at once.

MR. McKENNA: I stated that at question time.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL said he was not aware that the right hon. Gentleman had answered. Perhaps he would not mind telling them what the answer was.

MR. McKENNA: I said I had made representations to the local educational authority asking them to pay the salaries as soon as possible.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL said he was glad to hear that. That was certainly a step forward. Had the right hon. Gentleman had any reply?

MR. McKENNA: No reply yet.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL said he did not know whether, in the event of refusal, the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared to act further, but he submitted that, according to his duty, he ought to act. He gathered from his speech that he based the defence of his inaction on the fact that he was not strictly bound by the four corners of the Defaulting Authorities Act of 1904. The learned Attorney-General was no doubt going to say that relying on the strict wording of that Act the President of the Board of Education was not bound to take action unless the managers had incurred any expense, and that at present they had not. Surely, when they saw a large number of teachers not being paid although they had earned their salaries equally with other teachers, it was an odd interpretation of duty for the President of the Board of Education to say it was not necessary to take any steps in the matter. He could not help believing that on reflection the right hon. Gentleman would see that all the teachers ought to be treated fairly and equally. They heard much of religious equality, and it seemed to him it was the Party opposite who were breaking that principle. It ought to make no difference what school a teacher worked in, and no distinction in payment ought to be made on the ground of religious differences. If their salaries were all due on 1st July they ought all to be paid on 1st July. That was his idea of religious equality. Apparently it was not what the words conveyed to the right hon. Gentleman. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see what dangerous consequences would probably follow if he encouraged such differentiation. He objected to his whole method, which was wrong and objectionable. He could not understand anybody in an official position allowing organised delay of this kind to be tolerated any longer, and not taking prompt steps to stop it. This systematic and organised delay had been resorted to on several occasions, and he could not help noticing that the President of the Board of Education appeared to know very well when those occasions were. It occurred to him that perhaps he had had some hand in those earlier revolts, because he seemed to quote the date, "Christmas, 1904," very glibly and to know very well what occurred in 1905.

MR. McKENNA: Oh, no.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL said he was very glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman had no part in that agitation. He hoped the debate would lead to more satisfactory administration and remove a public scandal.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (SIR JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said that he was anxious to avoid the zone of fire which seemed to surround the county council for Merioneth as the education authority for that area. The Motion sought to attach censure to his right hon. friend, and it was suggested that something ought to be done by him in addition to making these representations to the educational authority of the county which he had told them he had made. As far as he could form any opinion on the subject his right hon. friend could do no more than he had done. It was a deplorable fact that the teachers were unpaid, and it was hinted that his right hon. friend had the right to use the public revenues for the purpose of supplementing the arrears of salary. He failed to understand that contention. The teachers were employed under contract by the managers of the schools. That situation was not forced by the House on the managers of these schools; it was a situation which they invited the House to place them in when the legislation of 1902 was passed. In the seventh section of that Act it was provided that the managers of the schools should have the exclusive power to appoint the teachers. That entailed the obligation of a contract, for which they alone were responsible, that the salaries of the teachers should be paid. It was the expression of a statutory liability in the form of a legal instrument, in which the managers of the schools accepted that responsibility. It was, therefore, clear that the obvious duty to pay the arrears fell on the managers. But it was also clear that Parliament had recognised that the managers might be placed in an awkward position. The Local Authorities Default Act contemplated, not the liability of the managers *in futuro*, but the expenditure they had made in the past. No question between the managers and the Education Department could arise until after an expenditure had been incurred. His right hon. friend therefore had no power to improve the situation until the managers had discharged the duty which rested on them by their own contract. When they had done that then they might have recourse to his right hon. friend. The noble Lord suggested that his right hon. friend might issue a circular holding out to the managers the hope that they would be reimbursed and giving a guarantee in reliance on which these payments might be made. Upon a question where principle arose, and where a point of conscience was said to be involved, it was of the utmost importance for a Minister to act within the law, and unless he had the power to do so he could not in law or propriety issue a circular.

LORD R. CECIL suggested that it was within the province of the Department to advise the managers that they would be safe in making the payment.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said the noble Lord knew very well that a guarantee would be read into the terms of such a letter, and the managers would say they paid relying on the assurance of the Department. The section contemplated that after the expense was incurred then the Minister could consider the circumstances and nature of the dispute. That was the position. What else could be done? The dilatory, obscure, antiquated method of enforcing compliance with a statutory obligation by *mandamus* was out of the question, because there existed the ordinary remedy by an action at law. The obvious remedy was for the managers to do their duty. They should not have entered into the contract if they were not prepared to abide by it. Let them fulfil their duty and then approach his right hon. friend, and if he proved impenetrable to sympathy, or, as had been suggested, was influenced by bias, there was the remedy in an action against the education authority, because they were clearly bound under Section 7 of the Act to indemnify the managers for expenditure properly incurred under the Act. That was the answer to the Motion. His right hon. friend had acted scrupulously within the law.

MR. LYTTELTON said the Motion had revealed a thoroughly discreditable state of affairs in Merionethshire. There had been a deliberate attempt to withhold salaries from voluntary school teachers at a time of year when the money was most needed. There had been no defence. There had been two lawyers' speeches, because the President of the Board of Education had dropped the administrator and had sheltered himself behind the most technical point of law, in which he was backed by the Attorney-General. But this was not a point of law at all. Under Section 7 of the Act of 1902, the local authority had the obligation to maintain the schools in efficient order, and, therefore, to pay the teachers. They might as well say that a man who had an obligation to maintain a building was not bound to pay the builder for doing the work as to say that the local Education Authority was not bound to pay the teachers. The managers had not the duty of paying the teachers; they had only the right to appoint them.

*Sir JOHN WALTON: The managers had entered into a contract; they were the masters of the teachers; they had the right to appoint and dismiss them. Moreover their contract with them expressly bound them to pay their salaries.

Mr. LYTTELTON said that if the right hon. Gentleman would point to any section which provided that the managers should pay the teachers he would admit that he was in error, but until he did that he could not. But supposing that it was a condition precedent to any action that the managers should have been sued. Clearly the administrative duty of the Board of Education was to tell the managers that they should pay. Circulars advising local authorities as to their legal obligations were frequently sent by the Home Office, the Local Government Board, and the Education Department. Why not in this case?

Mr. McKENNA said he had stated again and again that it was the managers' duty to pay the money. The Board of Education insisted on the managers signing a contract, and the teacher was not allowed the appointment until the contract was signed and the managers knew that perfectly.

Mr. LYTTELTON said that according to the right hon. Gentleman the managers had twice committed a breach of duty; he had asked the right hon. Gentleman if he had informed them that they had committed that breach, and if he himself would see that they should do their duty, and if he might use so discourteous a phrase the right hon. Gentleman had fenced and quibbled with the House upon this matter.

Mr. McKENNA said that he had no power to make the managers pay.

Mr. LYTTELTON said that he did not suggest he had. What the right hon. Gentleman could do was to advise and exhort them to pay, and it was well within his province to issue a circular to that effect. But, if as in this case, they were poor men and had no money to pay the right hon. Gentleman had only to give the information and the managers would be able to raise money on such a circular in order to discharge their duty. A number of men had been appointed managers under the Act, and they were anxious to do their duty and pay the teachers. The local authority were bound to give them the funds to pay, and the local authority had made wilful default, he cared not for what purpose, and those who sat on the Treasury Bench were bound to enforce the law. When right hon. Gentlemen opposite saw that the local authorities made default and that the managers were unable to pay they ought to say to the managers "we will see you through this, we will compel the local authority to pay, and you are perfectly entitled to discharge your first duty and pay the teachers." That was the plain course, and the technical objection of the Attorney-General was no answer at all. The fact remained that these poor teachers were now confronted with the loss of their salaries for some considerable time, or with litigation against the managers, or, as the Attorney-General said, the local authority could be brought into such an action and be made to indemnify the managers. It was possible that that might be so. But they were told that there being no contract between the teachers and the local authorities they could not be properly be brought into such an action. He did not for a moment put that authority against the authority of the Attorney-General.

Sir JOHN WALTON: They can be brought in as third parties.

Mr. LYTTELTON said he did not say that that was a good point of law. He knew the way in which bad points of law were fought in Wales; he knew very well what it would be. Provided there was any colourable pretext for resisting an action, he was certain that the pretext would be accepted, and these unfortunate teachers, who were deprived of their salaries and means of livelihood, would have the liability of an action, which he was perfectly certain would end in their favour, but which would cost them many a penny before they got the justice which the Board of Education ought to give them.

MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said that the question had been answered by the President of the Board of Education and the Attorney-General. Merionethshire had a population 90 per cent. of which consisted of Nonconformists who had dealt with the question of education in no niggardly way. He noticed that neither of the hon. Gentlemen who moved and seconded this Motion was in the House when the Defaulting Authorities Act was passed; if they had been they would have seen the whole of the Opposition march out because they were not allowed to take the main Amendment on this question, and he believed that the opposition in Wales had backed them up, not merely then, but during the last General Election, when they sent up every Member a Liberal to that House. But that was not the principal question before the House. Who were the managers of these schools? Four of them were Churchmen, and he ventured to say that, apart from his hon. friend the Member for Merionethshire who was a Churchman and a Liberal, nearly all the extensive landlords in that county were Churchmen and Conservatives; they were the people who had tried to retain the denominational schools at the expense of the rates. Let the rich landlords and Churchmen take pity on the hardships of these teachers. Merionethshire was a rich county to begin with, so far as the landlords were concerned; but the Nonconformists, who were 90 per cent. of the population of the county, were amongst the poorest in Wales; and yet what had they done for education in Merionethshire? It was worth while that hon. Gentlemen opposite, who knew absolutely nothing of the facts, should know this, namely, that peasants, labourers, small tradesmen, and quarrymen had spent more on education, elementary, higher, university, and technical, than not merely any other county, but more in proportion than Prussia, which, it was known, had done more than any other State in Europe in behalf of education. It was the Nonconformists of Merionethshire who had done all that, and they sent Church boys and Church girls to their secondary and university schools to be maintained at their expense. The Nonconformists had never kept away a single Church girl or Church lad who had won scholarships. It was the quarrymen who first of all endowed the universities of Wales with scholarships, and the children of Tories and Churchmen had benefited from the action of the Nonconformists. Why? Because these institutions were controlled by people who had no sectarian feeling. That was the main question. ["No."] His hon. and right hon. friends had proved that; they had knocked the bottom out of the legal argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite with regard to the duties of the local authorities under the Act of 1902. The contract was not between the teachers and the local authority, but between the teachers and the managers, and they could not make the Central Department a sort of county court to compel the local education authorities to pay the salaries of the teachers. In his own county of Anglesey, and in the Division which he represented, they had come to an understanding on the education question, and there was no cause to grumble. Let hon. Gentlemen opposite come and help them to deal fairly with these schools, and all these teachers would be paid. Let them not stand on a mere quibble of the law. ["Oh."] He said "quibble" because they had not had a right exposition or interpretation of the law from hon. Gentlemen opposite. They had not given the right interpretation of it, firstly, because the education authority had not incurred the liability, and secondly, the Board of Education had no right to compel the local education authority to pay. The only way to settle this question was for Churchmen and Conservatives to deal with it in other counties as generously as they had done in Wales. In that way they would do away with sectarian bitterness and sectarian prejudices. During the controversy in Merionethshire, a Churchman and one of the hierarchy, said what a pity it was that the Education Bill did not give more facilities for Church teaching; and a Church teacher, the headmaster of a National Church School, got up and said—"Why, the Bill gives us more facilities than we have now, for we only teach the Catechism once a week, and this Bill gives us facilities to teach it twice a week." He wished hon. Gentlemen opposite would help them by assisting to transfer these schools to the local authorities, and then the whole of the teachers would be properly and adequately paid, and there would be no religious bickerings or sectarianism. He made an earnest appeal to all classes concerned in the interests of true citizenship to end this miserable petty squabble.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said he desired to bring the House back to the real matter before it. They had heard from the hon. Member for Merionethshire a speech admitting their whole case. The hon. Member had admitted that it was the duty of the local education authority to provide funds for payment of the teachers. He had admitted that the authority had refused to do this, and the only reason given for that refusal was that the local education authority in Merionethshire did not approve of the Act of Parliament under which those salaries were payable. The hon. Member said they were going to continue the fight against the Act of 1902. Was that fight to be carried on by depriving these unfortunate teachers for weeks and months of salaries which were admittedly due? Was that a fair way to carry on a contest for conscience sake? It was said that these teachers knew they would not be paid and they ought to have resigned. Was that really the case for Merionethshire? Because a man knew that he was going to be cheated out of his salary was he to resign his post? Was it not possible that the teachers felt some kind of duty towards the managers and the children? Was it not even possible that they relied on the Government of the country to see that the local education authority did its duty? Not a single Minister had said a word in defence of the action of the local authority. It would have been a surprising thing if the Attorney-General or the Minister for Education had ventured to defend what seemed to him to be a gross and flagrant illegality. The hardship being admitted, they asked the Government to come to the rescue and find a remedy. What was the answer they received? The Minister for Education said the managers ought to pay. He agreed that they were legally liable to pay, but many of the managers were no more able to provide these funds than the teachers were able to do without their salaries. The right hon. Gentleman said: "Let the teachers sue the managers." Really, was that the answer of the Government? To sue meant further delay, and judgment could not be obtained before the end of September. That was rather a hard course to suggest especially when the managers were willing to pay but had not been provided with the means. There was an easy course open to the Government. They suggested that a simple letter should be written to the managers to the effect that the money would be refunded if they paid the salaries of the teachers by the Board of Education under the Act of 1904. The answer of the right hon. Gentleman was that the Government could not take that course until they had heard what the Local Education Authority had to say on the subject. But the Government had already written to that authority pressing them to pay, and the authority had not thought fit to reply. If necessary, they could be pressed for an answer. But failing some explanation other than that which had been given to-day the course of the Board of Education was clear. He was sure that the Government did not wish to make themselves the accomplices of the local authority. If so, let the Government meet this Motion in the spirit in which it was made and the whole difficulty would be at an end.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said that the President of the Board of Education had done all he could in regard to representations to the local education authority. The hon. Member for Merionethshire had told them that the local education authority were at the end of their tether and had not sufficient money out of the grants in hand to pay the teachers their salaries. He gathered that in the past they had a surplus in hand, but now it had gone and the demands of the teachers could not be met in consequence. He would recommend his right hon.

friend to inquire if that was the case. If it was the case, it seemed to him to be a proper one for putting the Defaulting Authorities Act in operation. Failing that, his right hon. friend should consider whether some new system could be devised whereby these schools might be put on a satisfactory basis. This was a small matter in a small county. The teachers needed their salaries, and every other consideration apart, they ought to have their salaries paid. It was particularly hard that they could not use some part of their salaries in taking a holiday away from the county. This was an exceptional case in the whole of the Principality.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he wished to reply to some observations which fell from the hon. Gentleman who seconded the Motion. He desired to redeem the character of the county of Montgomeryshire and to assure the hon. Member for Barkston Ash that the facts were not as had been represented. It was not the case that the delay in paying the teachers was due to sectarian feeling, for the head of the Education Committee for Montgomery actually paid the salaries of a great many teachers and guaranteed an overdraft at the bank.

MR. LANE-FOX said he only referred to the case as one in which action was taken by the late Government.

*MR. REES said the Government of the day took action in that case, and deducted the salaries from the grants earned. He understood however that the action which was taken was illegal. He must regard the Attorney-General as the best possible authority in this matter, and the hon. and learned Gentleman had told the House that the hon. Member for Oxford University had been guilty of bad and unconstitutional law in what he did. However, his point was that there had been no callous disregard of the sufferings of the voluntary school teachers in the county a district of which he had the honour to represent, and no sectarian persecution. There had been the assertion of a great principle, but so far from its having been associated with hardships to individuals, or disregard of their claims, the local education authority had gone to great lengths to obviate the occurrence of hardships to those whose salaries were inevitably paid later than would have been the case had there been no effort to force the local authorities to carry out a policy of which they disapproved. The charge that the action of the county council had been illegal fell to the ground.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that every word which had been uttered as an explanation or apology by the hon. Member for Montgomery was a separate condemntion for Merioneth. Nobody defended the action which had been taken by Merionethshire, not even the Member for Merionethshire, and he was quite sure the Minister for Education did not defend it.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS: The right hon. Gentleman was not present in the House when I spoke.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that although he had not had the honour of hearing the hon. Member's speech, he had done his best to inform himself of its substance. He understood that there was no question whether Merionethshire had obeyed the law, the only question being whether the people of Merioneth had obeyed their consciences. Therefore from the legal point of view Merionethshire stood without defence, and the only question the House of Commons had to discuss was whether in the illegal action of Merionethshire, His Majesty's Government were to be counted as accomplices. It was evident from the speeches made by the Government that they were not only accomplices, but willing and deliberate accomplices. The Minister for Education was perfectly aware, and did not deny that he was aware, that the illegal action of the County Council of Merionethshire had been the cause of inflicting a great deal of undeserved suffering upon men who were certainly poor, who had certainly earned their salaries, and who certainly needed their salaries more at this time of the year than at any other. He admitted that the teachers, men and women, were not many. An hon. Member had said that it was a small matter because it concerned few people. He admitted that it concerned few people, but he did not admit that it was a small matter. It was important to the men and their families that the salaries honestly earned should be honestly paid. They had not been honestly paid; and the President of the Board of Education had not pretended that the Government had used their administrative powers to tell the managers that if they paid the salaries the legitimate authority and undoubted powers of the Government would be used to see that the unquestioned debt of the local authority was discharged. The managers could not be blamed because they had not advanced the salaries out of their own pockets. It was not the business of any man in this country to pay money out of his own pocket which should be paid out of the rates. He believed that the managers had been ready to advance money if the Government had said that they would be liable for it.

Mr. McKENNA: The Law Courts would compel them.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: How? By *mandamus*? It was the duty of the Government to assure them that the rates, which were liable in law, would be made liable in fact.

Mr. McKENNA: No; the sum could be recovered by an action in the county court.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman's idea of the way for a poor and hard-worked teacher to spend an agreeable holiday was to bring an action against his employer in the county court. The teachers in the schools should be under the guardianship of the Minister for Education, but the right hon. Gentleman had not given them any advice except to bring an action against a public authority. The managers, had they been assured that the Government would exercise their undoubted rights and extract from the local authority their undoubted debts, would no doubt have been perfectly ready to help their teachers over the time of difficulty. Why did not the Government give that assurance? They had ample power to do so.

***Sir JOHN WALTON**: Their powers are stated in and are limited by the statute.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said it was in the Act of Parliament that the education authority "may" do it, not that they "must" do it.

Mr. McKENNA: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly read the section—Section 1, Subsection (*b*). When the managers have paid, when the condition, in other words, has arisen, then I shall have to consider whether it is expedient that they should be recouped.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the section stated that if it appeared to the Board of Education that the managers of a school, on account of any default of the local education authority in the performance of their duties, had, for the purpose of maintaining and keeping efficient the school, incurred any expenses payable by the local authority the Board might pay to the managers such amount in respect of those expenses as, in the opinion of the Board, was properly incurred. He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman on this technical point that he could not pay out of public funds money to the managers until they had themselves incurred any expense. Nobody doubted that. But what they did say was that the Board of Education should have informed the managers that, if they did incur expense under the Act, the Education Department would consider it a case in which the Act should be put in force. If they had done that, the teachers would have got their emoluments. They had not done that because they thought it better to be in collusion with the illegal action of those county authorities, and that no encouragement should be given to any manager of the voluntary schools to pay the teachers. That was the policy of the Party to which the right hon. Gentleman belonged and of the Government of which he was a Member. It was publicly avowed. Nobody denied it. He did not particularly quarrel with that, profoundly as he disagreed with it. He did not take exception to any Gentleman in a public position saying "We object altogether to voluntary schools."

That was an intelligible policy, although, in his opinion, a wrong one. But that that policy, whether good or bad, should be advanced by the petty persecution of the county council for Merionethshire, backed by the Education Department and this House, was a procedure totally new in our political and public history; for hitherto Ministers on that Bench, however much opposed to voluntary schools, had never sunk to using weapons of that kind. They had never condescended to visit upon the heads of these hard-worked, poor, and helpless teachers the sins of a system of which they disapproved. He thought the House, having before it the case as presented by the two Gentlemen on that Bench, whatever their views might be, however much they disapproved of the voluntary schools, and however much they thought parents should be deprived of the right to have their children given the religious education they desired, might, at all events, abstain from methods utterly mean and wholly beneath the dignity of a powerful Ministry supported by a great majority.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 78; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 376.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnes, G. N.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clynes, J. R.
Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gordon, J.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham
Hills, J. W.
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jowett, F. W.
Kennaway,Rt. Hon.SirJohnH.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson,Wm.G.(Petersfield)
O'Grady, J.
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shackleton, David James
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford East)
Steadman, W. C.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Walker,Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH (Susex,E.Grinst'd)
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne
Dunne,MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.

Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamont, Norman
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Partington, Oswald
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Waring, Walter
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshir
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, in moving a Resolution allocating three days to the Report stage and one day to the Third Reading of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, said he trusted it would not be so keenly criticised as his previous Motion in connection with the Small Landowners (Scotland) Bill. The Resolution which was in similar terms to those adopted in the case of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, provided that on the first allotted day new clauses and Clauses 1 to 5 should be disposed of; on the second day the other clauses to the end of Part II.; and on the third day the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules. In the case of the one Bill, as of the other, the Government had endeavoured to allot the time in such a way as to give the best opportunity for considering important matters. On the first day the House would be able to discuss the relations between the central and local authorities; on the second day the compulsory acquisition of land; and on the third day the machinery of the Bill. He hoped the Opposition would admit the desire of the Government to secure at any rate the best use of time and a sufficient occasion for the consideration of all matters of primary importance. He trusted that the Motion would be found to be free from some of the difficulties which had stood in the way of the earlier Motion.

*MR. CAVE pointed out that the reprint of the Bill supplied to the Committee from day to day did not show where the new clauses were intended to be inserted, and until a reprint of the whole Bill could be obtained hon. Members were not in a position to criticise the allocation of time which the Prime Minister proposed.

*MR. SPEAKER said that that was a matter for discussion. The Prime Minister had no doubt a copy of the Bill and had drawn up his Resolution in accordance with its provisions.

MR. CHAPLIN said that thanks to the kindness of Mr. Speaker he had been able to obtain a copy of the Bill. It was, he believed, a proof but without it it would have been impossible for him to have moved any Amendment to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman.

There were many Members who were not so fortunate as he in this regard, and he objected to the Motion on the ground that the Bill as reprinted with the new clauses was not obtainable in the Vote Office and that, therefore, it was not possible for them to move Amendments to the Motion. He spoke with great deference, but he never recollected any occasion where the guillotine had been moved before the Bill was printed, and before hon. Members had had an opportunity of giving notice of Amendments.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the Motion had been most carefully drafted with reference to the clauses in the Bill as reprinted in the course of the proceedings in the Committee from day to day, and except that it contained a provision between the first and second subheads the division of the Bill into parts remained the same as they were.

MR. CHAPLIN said that the right hon. Gentleman did not quite appreciate the position. There were seven new clauses which were now incorporated in the Bill and the situation of those clauses could only be known to those who had seen the Bill. It was impossible therefore for any hon. Member to move an Amendment to the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman on the ground that he did not think the time allocated was fairly proportioned.

*MR. SPEAKER, in reply to the point of order, said it was unfortunate that the House was not in possession of the Bill as reprinted, but, still, he had no doubt the Prime Minister would give every information, and he did not think he could rule that the Motion should not be put.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Report Stage of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill be brought to a conclusion in three allotted days; and

(*a*) That the new clauses and Clauses 1 to 5 of the Bill be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; and

(*b*) That the Clauses of the Bill following Clause 5 to the end of Part II. of the Bill (if and so far as not previously disposed of), be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; and

(*c*) That the remaining Clauses of the Bill and the Schedules and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage of the Bill to a conclusion (if and so far as not previously disposed of) be proceeded with on the third allotted day, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

Any day on which the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this order.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any new Clauses or Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given (but no other Clauses or Amendments), and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new Clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the Clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

Any Private Business which is set down for consideration at 8.15 p.m. on any allotted day shall, instead of being taken on that day as provided by the Standing Order 'Time for taking Private Business,' be taken immediately after the conclusion of the proceedings on the Bill for that day, and any Private Business so taken may be proceeded with, though opposed, notwithstanding the Standing Order "Sittings of the House."

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday or Saturday at 5 p.m., Mr. Speaker shall put forthwith any question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

After the passing of this order on any day on which any proceedings on the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion to re-commit the Bill, nor Motion for adjournment under Standing Order 10, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. CHAPLIN said, under all the circumstances of the case, unless he were ruled out of order, he thought he should best perform his duty by moving the adjournment of the debate, in order that those who desired might have an opportunity of seeing the Bill, and of moving any Amendments which they thought right to submit.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said that a considerable number of Members on that side of the House, who had no violent view upon this Bill, felt that a measure of this kind was one touching many questions of deep political interest, upon which they thought they had a right, he would not say a right, but something approaching a right, to speak. The new method with a Bill of this description was to send it upstairs. It was quite true, and if the Prime Minister urged it he would concede the point, that by searching the newspapers and all the official documents they might apprise themselves from day to day and week to week of what was going on upstairs; but the right hon. Gentleman could hardly reproach them for not having done so. When the new rules were passed they believed that in the case of a Bill sent upstairs they would have an opportunity of reviewing the work of the Grand Committee as a whole and pronouncing their opinion upon it. But even that opportunity was limited by the guillotine. Surely, in view of this guillotine Motion, they had a right to consider what portions of the Bill they would select for discussion. What was to become of the House as a debating assembly? This was one of the great Bills of the Government; it was not a minor matter. The Prime Minister himself introduced his land policy at a public meeting, assisted by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and he announced that this was one of their main lines of policy. They used a certain amount of imagery to impress the importance of the case upon the public. They said the curtain had rung up on a play that was to have a long run. What run was the play to have if the curtain was rung down before the band played the overture? The Opposition were in earnest about this matter, because Englishmen must take an interest in a measure of this kind. They might differ, but they would be glad to agree. There was no settled determination on the part of the Opposition to resist this Bill, but they thought that they ought to discuss it. They thought that the Prime Minister ought not to introduce a policy affecting land tenure in England, one of the oldest civilisations in Europe, without allowing them an opportunity of discussing what parts of the Bill they would desire under the guillotine to debate. They had not yet seen the Bill nor considered what portions of it they should discuss and what parts the Government should have their own way about without discussion. The Prime Minister, he believed, was the oldest Member of the House. He appealed to him, not as Prime Minister but as Father of the House of Commons, to agree to this Motion for the adjournment of the debate, and to say that it was not unreasonable for the Opposition and for the whole House to have one or two days in which to study the Bill in the form in which it had been put in Committee by only a small section of the House.

MR. LANE-FOX said he was a member of the Small Holdings Committee, and naturally he knew more than a good many Members of the House what the contents of the Bill were. Owing to circumstances over which he had no control, however, he was unable to attend the Committee during the last three days when the new clauses were discussed. Therefore he was just as much in the dark as to those new clauses as other hon. Members. It was difficult even for Members of the Committee to discuss the limitations under which the Bill should be debated until the Bill was printed, and they had it in their hands. Every Member of the House must admit, and the Prime Minister himself, he thought, would not deny, that an entirely new situation had arisen. The Prime Minister, in his passion for the guillotine, in his desire for uniformity of treatment of measures, had forgotten that comparative harmony and peace characterised the discussion of this Bill under the very able management of his colleague. There was no dealing with the closure, such as stained the consideration of the other Bill in connection with which they had just had a discussion. It was only when the Bill came before the House that they applied the guillotine; but in this instance the House was asked to pass this resolution actually before the Bill was in print, or had got out of its swaddling clothes. In the interests of proper discussion and of the Bill itself the Government ought to accept the Motion for the adjournment of the debate. The *Tribune*, a newspaper highly respected by Ministerialists, had declared that the opposition to the Bill did not come from those Members around him, but that the discussion had come mainly from earnest Radicals advocating vague schemes of land reform. In view of the interest which different sections had in the Bill, the large interests involved, and the general desire they had to make it a success and not obstruct its progress, he thought they might be spared the insult of this guillotine Motion until at all events they had an opportunity of knowing to what parts of the Bill they would desire to give their attention. He hoped the Prime Minister would accept the Motion.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that a copy of the Bill as amended had been in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who had been conducting negotiations with regard to it with the First Commissioner of Works. As the Bill had been reprinted down to the 40th clause, he could not see any ground for complaint. There were, of course, one or two new clauses to be inserted. Whilst he admitted that it would have been better if they had been able to place a complete copy of the Bill in the hands of hon. Members, he did not see any reason at all for adjourning the debate.

MR. CHAPLIN said the Prime Minister was wholly inaccurate in regard to what he had said about his having taken away the copy of the Bill. He had seen merely a proof of the Bill and he had only been allowed to do so by the courtesy of Mr. Speaker. No one else had seen it and nobody else had had the opportunity of seeing it. As seven new clauses were going to be added to the Bill it was quite impossible for any hon. Member not acquainted with the way those new clauses were going to be allocated to move any Amendments to the guillotine Motion. The Prime Minister had offered no reasonable reply or excuse which met their objection to the situation which had arisen, and that being so he would press the Motion.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said he required to criticse the guillotine Motion in regard to one of its provisions.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Member must wait until the guillotine Motion is taken as a substantive Motion.

MAJOR SEELY said he understood that he could debate that point on the Motion for adjournment.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Member understood wrongly.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) said that during the first two days under the guillotine they had to pass some twenty-two clauses and seven new clauses which had been accepted in Committee. It made the greatest possible difference where those clauses came in the Bill when it was printed. In regard to the proceedings which had taken place in Committee he felt sure the hon. Baronet the Member for South Somerset would agree with him that there had been a good sound debate all through the Committee stage and no obstruction whatever. He thought the Government would be adopting a wise course in postponing this question until some opportunity had been given them of seeing the Bill as it would appear when the new clauses had been inserted. He was sure the hon. Baronet opposite realised the importance of these new clauses and perhaps he might be able to induce the Prime Minister to reconsider his decision and agree to the adjournment of the debate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose to a point of order. He wished to ask how, if any Gentlemen on either side of the House desired to move an Amendment with regard to the modification of the compartments, he could do it, not having the Bill before him showing the clauses as they would stand for discussion. It seemed to him that there would certainly be Amendments moved dealing with the allocation of the time.

*MR. SPEAKER: The advice I would give him would be to borrow a copy of the Bill from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon, who has borrowed my copy.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that that answer was surely conclusive as to the line which ought to be taken now. The House should not be asked to pass a guillotine resolution like the present which required them to deal in three days with a Bill of forty-seven clauses which had never been before the House at all. It was really carrying tyrrany too far to ask them to make their Amendments as to the allocation of time when the only Bill available was one belonging to Mr. Speaker, which had not been laid on the Table of the House, and which by the courtesy of Mr. Speaker had been put in the hands of one individual. He wished to make an appeal to the common-sense and fairness of Gentlemen in all parts of the House, hoping that the Leader of the House would find it impossible to resist the appeal.

MR. LAMBTON said that as a private Member he protested against the business of the House being left entirely in the hands of the two front benches. Private Members had some right to take part in the discussions of the House. He thought it was an insult to be told of private arrangements between the right hon. Gentlemen on the two front benches.

MR. MILDMAY reminded the Prime Minister that the rank and file had a duty to perform in criticising the legislation brought before the House. Surely they had a right to know what they were called upon to vote for. At present they did not know what the compartments were going to include. How was it possible for hon. Members to discuss these matters under the circumstances? He was sure the Prime Minister would see how unfair it was to propose the Motion under the circumstances. During the many years he had been in the House he had never known a case in which it was more incumbent on private Members to speak out.

MR. STANLEY WILSON thought the Prime Minister had excelled himself on the present occasion. He and his friends wanted to know where they were in regard to this Motion. Private Members were not to receive any consideration from the Government. They protested against being so treated. He thought the request they were making was a most reasonable one. How was it possible for private Members to discuss a Motion with regard to a measure which they had had no opportunity of seeing? He was not a Member of the Committee, and he had not the faintest idea of what Amendments had been moved upstairs and what Amendments had been accepted by the Government. The newspaper reports were of a very meagre character. He had heard that seven new clauses had been introduced and accepted in Committee. It was absurd for the Prime Minister to ask hon. Members to accept this Motion before they had seen those clauses. He thought private Members might be afforded greater opportunities for taking part in the discussions than they had at present. If the true feeling of the House was indicated in the division lobby there would be no uncertainty about carrying the Motion for the adjournment.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN admitted that it was a matter for some degree of regret that Members had not been put in possession of the Bill. He had fully expected that by this afternoon the Bill would have been in the hands of Members, but it was not owing to the absence of the Member of the Government who had been most keen in accelerating the business arrangements upstairs that the Bill had not been available.

MR. CHAPLIN: The Bank holiday.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he was searching about for a reason why the Bill was not in the hands of Members. He believed the inconvenience was of the most infinitesimal kind. He did not think the fact that they had not the Bill in their possession should affect the putting down of Amendments as to the allocation of time under the guillotine, but still he admitted that it was hardly dealing fairly with Members to invite them to put down Amendments to the Bill which they had not seen. He was impressed by that, and, therefore, he would not resist the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, but as the Government could not afford to lose a day they would take this Bill and other Government business on Saturday.

Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned," put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

COUNCIL OF INDIA BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs), in moving the Second Reading of the Council of India Bill, said he had prefixed to it a short note which explained, he hoped, in a thoroughly concise and clear way what the object of the Bill was. When the Government of India was transferred to the Government of the Crown, the number of the members of the Council was fixed at fifteen, but since then for various reasons, with which he need not trouble the House, the number had been reduced to twelve. Under present circumstances it had seemed to the Government perfectly clear that it was desirable to have larger room for the representation of various interests which were becoming more and more important. Therefore, they asked the House to allow the Secretary of State to increase the number of members of Council from twelve to fourteen. The Secretary for India would not be obliged to appoint fourteen members, but the Council must never consist of less than ten members. That being the case it was natural to consider some other conditions of the constitution of the Council of India, which in the mind of the Secretary of State of both parties were thought worthy of consideration. For instance, at present a Member of the Council might have been absent from India for twenty-five years. That term seemed to be excessive. Therefore, the Government proposed to enact that absence from India at the time of appointment should not exceed five years. That would be of great importance to secure freshness of views on the part of the advisers of the Secretary of State. Then, in the same direction it was proposed that the term of occupancy of office should be reduced from ten to seven years, and that the emoluments should be reduced from £1,200 to £1,000 a year. These alterations themselves, he thought the House would agree, were of no very great importance; the most important part of the Bill being increase in the number of the Council. He would remind his hon. friend below the Gangway, who had an Amendment on the Paper, that when the present constitution of the Indian Council was set up, the magnitude and intricacy of the details of Indian Government were sufficient cause for increasing the number of the Council to fifteen. He did not think that any Member could find any reasonable objection to the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed:—"That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that so far as he was concerned there was no objection to the Second Reading of the Bill, although he confessed he looked with dismay on the proposal that the salaries in future of the members of the Indian

Council in this country were to be reduced from £1,200 to £1,000. He was not sure that that was a wise proposal. He had not had an opportunity of consulting his friends who knew India better than he did, but he would have thought that if they desired to get officials of the highest ability and capacity in the future for the Council it would be penny wise and pound foolish to reduce the emoluments even by £200 as was proposed to do in the Bill. But the right hon. Gentleman might have reasons of which he knew nothing which would justify the policy he advocated. However, that part of the question did not touch the part of the Second Reading, and he welcomed the measure.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth) said he rose to oppose this Bill. He believed that it had been brought in with the very best intentions. The right hon. Gentleman wished to increase the number of his advisers in this country, not only men who were acquainted with Indian affairs, but Indians also. He felt that a Bill dealing with the constitution of the Council of India ought not to have been introduced at the fag-end of a session. This Bill was not quite so small a measure as it seemed. The Council of India was the only check on autocratic Government, and the intention of creating that Council was to give the Secretary of State advisers who would be independent and best fitted to give advice. A Council of India had been in existence for fifty years, and at first it was a very remarkable and independent body consisting of seven members of the Old East India Company and eight independent members. As year by year passed the Council had become more an official body and notorious, in the words of Lord Curzon, for its obsolete hugger-mugger methods. If a Viceroy of India could so describe it, it was well that they should look closely into its constitution. All measures and orders by the Secretary of State were laid on the Table of the Council for its members to express their opinion in writing. Though the whole of the members of the Council might differ from the Secretary of State, he had only to express his decision in a Minute, and the matter went no further. It never came to the knowledge of this House. The Secretary of State and the members of the Council might absolutely disagree, and this House had no opportunity of knowing it. That ought to be changed. Then on several points the Council might not be consulted at all. There were two specifically laid down by the Act. All urgent matters and all matters of secrecy might be dealt with by the Secretary of State without consulting the Council. Nearly all important matters were either urgent or secret. There might be some clause in the Bill giving Parliament an opportunity of knowing how things were going on in the Council. What they now had was only criticism of officials by ex-officials, and he must say that that ran contrary to their ideas of administration in this country. Let them imagine the Home Office criticised only by retired and pensioned ex-officials of the Home Department. He greatly desired to see members introduced into the Secretary of State's Council who would be as independent and hold as high a position as the Commercial Member and the Finance Member. It was understood that the Secretary of State was about to appoint two Indians. The House would naturally ask who those natives were to be. One knew that for many years Indians were appointed on the legislative councils and that they had no authority, but were the mere nominees of the Government. He was afraid the same thing was going to happen here. Surely, if the Bill was postponed till next year the Secretary of State might consider how he could get on his Council more independent opinion and advice. There was nothing he regarded with greater fear than the introduction of native members into the Secretary of State's Council, unless they were sure that they would be representative men. He was quite sure his right hon. friend would appoint two admirable men, but he would not always be in office, and the men he appointed might die or resign and the next who came along might not be so useful or authoritative. If the Secretary of State could come down to the House and say that what he recommended had the support of his Council, including representative Indians, his proposal would have great weight;

but if these natives were mere figureheads they would have no influence. He knew that it would be urged that they should get the measure through, but he was not entirely in agreement with that feeling. After having waited forty-nine years, they could wait a few months longer, and, if the measure could be taken up next session and debated thoroughly, they would lose very little. He felt that they should have a much broader measure of reform, and that if this Bill were passed they would hardly be likely to get another chance next year. He believed it was even more necessary that the English section of the Secretary of State's Council should be reformed than that natives of India should be introduced. It was of the utmost importance that men of independence and character should be appointed. It was most essential that some half-dozen of the Secretary of State's Council should be as independent as the present commercial and financial members. He begged to move that the Bill should be read that day three months.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.) said he rose with great regret to second the rejection of the Bill, but there were certain features in it which seemed to him rather dangerous. He understood that the Council was the only check upon the autocratic government of India. It seemed to him that when Questions were asked in that House all the answers were stereotyped and came from the same source and were alway sin the interests of the bureaucracy of India. The most serious point revealed that night was that important matters connected with India never came before the Council at all. If that was so, it seemed to him that there was absolutely no need for the Council to exist. Then it was almost impossible to accept criticism by ex-officials upon the Secretary of State. The Bill made provision for two natives to sit upon the Council.

MR. MORLEY: The Secretary of State may appoint two or he may not.

MR. O'GRADY said he knew it did not specifically lay down that two native members should be appointed, but he presumed that was the purpose the right hon. Gentleman had in view. However estimable they might be, and however high they might stand in the opinion of the Indian people, they would only delay things, and it did not seem to him they would have much weight in the Council. The best course would be to appoint some Member of that House on the Council. He did not mean that they should have any emoluments. It seemed to him that that would be a particularly advisable course to pursue, and in his opinion the Council ought to change with the Government. He wished to enter his protest against the way things were carried on out in India, and to urge that if the Bill were delayed till next session it might be broadened so as to make it one of real reform for the Indian people.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Questionto add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Charles O'Donnell*).

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that the hon. Member who made this Motion generally approached Indian subjects from the point of view of those "who were oppressed and had no comforter" except himself and the two or three others of the like mind who were gathered together in that House, but on this occasion he suggested that the comfort, which had been offered, should be postponed. One would have thought that the measure would have been welcomed as an instalment of comfort to the oppressed. It was better late than never, and, if the measure was a good measure, the earlier the better. Secondly, the hon. Member said the Bill was such a little one that it should not be passed. That again was a very bad reason, and he quoted the opinion of Lord Curzon, whose policy he and the two or three others who were gathered together had most comprehensively condemned during the debates on the Indian Budget. The hon. Member also asked why a Council could not be established of men as independent as the Commercial and Public Works Members, who happened not to be officials. He would like to know why he suggested that the official members on the Council were not independent. He could not imagine men occupying a more independent position. As a matter of fact they could not look for any further advancement. The Secretary of State, however much he might desire it, could do nothing more for them. Once they were appointed they were practically independent of him. Why did the hon. Member suggest that they were wanting in independence and rectitude?

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL said he never spoke of their rectitude. He objected to ex-officials being the sole critics of officials. He feared official bias. The members of the Indian Council were as distinguished men as existed in England or the Empire.

*MR. REES said that that disclaimer was hardly in keeping with the condemnation of the hon. Member's speech, and if a member of the Council were wanting in independence, he failed to see how he could be full of rectitude. Independence was the outward and visible sign of rectitude. At what point in their careers did the hon. Member and the two or three who thought with him discover that officials were not independent and were not good advisers? Supposing the Government of India had thought fit to invite the hon. Member to serve longer in India by promoting him to a higher position, there was nothing in the hon. Member's past career to make him believe that he would not have continued to perform the excellent service he had performed and to carry out without cavil or objection the orders of the Indian Government, including, for instance, the partition of Bengal, had he, or one of the other hon. Members of his little party been appointed to the charge of either of the Bengal Lieutenant-Governorships. When an ex-official came and suggested that his brother officials were wanting in independence, they should see whether he was justified, and he submitted that the hon. Member had no justification for making such a statement. He invited those who put forward this view, in justice to the service to which they belonged, to the Indian Government, to the House, and to themselves, to tell the House what discovery of moral obliquity or administrative incapacity induced them immediately they left the service of the Government of India to withdraw from it that confidence which he believed they felt in it during the quarter of a century or longer during which they served it. The hon. Member who seconded the Motion described himself as one interested in the natives, but did he really think that differentiated him in any way from other hon. Members? Whilst the hon. Member had no acquaintance with the natives of India he might on that ground hesitate before he made up his mind that all those who did know them and were carrying on the Government of India, were not capable of fulfilling the high functions with which they were entrusted. The hon. Gentleman said that members of the Council were mere dummies. He thought that was far indeed from the fact. and to none of the ex-civil servants who were appointed members of Council had been vouchsafed the revelation of the incompetence and servility of the Government of India and its servants which had been vouchsafed to the hon. Members, whose views on Indian affairs were those of the Hindu Congress and the Bengal agitators. It was perhaps hardly in order to take it for granted that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State proposed to appoint any natives of India to his Council, seeing that the Bill contained no reference to Indians or to any other race, but since this assumption had been made, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would appoint natives; if would be an admirable measure if he did. But he protested against the suggestion of the hon. Member who moved this Motion as to the men who would be representative, because he meant that those men alone would be representative who held the views of the hon. Gentleman—the views of the Bengalis of Calcutta, or rather of a section of the Babus of that city, and not of men who could and would represent the masses of India. He did not think that the Secretary of State would appoint men other than those who were truly representative of India, and they were not to be found among those who came over here and were accepted by the people of this country as authorities, although they had renounced the religion and caste of the natives and were, themselves in turn, renounced by the natives. As regarded the reduction of salary to which the Leader of the Opposition made certain objections, he would venture to suggest that members of the Civil Service and other officials who came home from India would not refuse an appointment because the salary was reduced from £1,200 to £1,000. He thought this reduction was probably a wise measure because by it the cost of appointing the extra members would be met, and he was quite certain it was very desirable to reduce the period of absence from India for appointment purposes from ten years to five. He might say for the benefit of those hon. Members who smiled at that, that he left India more than five years ago, and was, like most Indian officials and ex-officials, perfectly independent, and speaking with perfect sincerity, of matters which affected him personally and pecuniarily in no way whatever. He thought this was an extremely good Bill and he was very sorry to find that any hon. Member who wanted to improve the position of the Council, and was filled with vague and ill-defined yearnings to do something magnificently revolutionary in character, should suggest that it should be passed next session or some other time instead of at the earliest possible moment.

*SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.) supported the Second Reading of the Bill, though he confessed that his anxiety to see the Bill passed into law had been slightly weakened by the speech of the hon. Member who had spoken just before him. He was almost afraid that his desire to support his right hon. friend the Secretary of State might be a mistaken one, because he felt that if he went into the same lobby with the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs upon any Indian subject he might very possibly make a mistake. However that might be, he would certainly advise the House, if they would pay any attention to his advice in the matter, to support the Secretary of State for India and agree to the Second Reading of this Bill. He was personally not very friendly to the scheme for the enlargement of the Council that the Secretary of State had submitted, but he did not want to waste the time of the House by discussing the constitution of the Council. He freely admitted he did not like the enlargement of the Council; but in other respects the Bill seemed to him to be an excellent one, and its provisions were in the direction of greater efficiency. Although there were many points on which he would have liked to have spoken he thought at that late hour it was sufficient to say that the Bill had his general support and approval.

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) said he only desired to offer his hearty support to the Bill. He agreed with his hon. friend who had just spoken that on any point with respect to Indian administration he was afraid he would be in the wrong lobby if he found himself in the lobby with the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs. The Bill was a very mild one, but to his mind it had the saving grace that it moved in the right direction, namely, that it tended to keep the Indian Council more abreast of the changes in the opinions and condition of the Indian people. The restriction of the time of absence from India of a nominee for the Council was wise, because opinions and events in India now moved rapidly, and if the nominees for the Council were workmanlike, independent men who had quite recently been among the people and took a real interest in their affairs, the more useful to the progressive administration of India they would be. He would only add to his support of the Bill one suggestion. If it had been possible to introduce a provision enacting that there should be, as in the case of the Colonies, a periodical Indian Conference it would very much strengthen the hands of the Secretary for India. There was no doubt that if the right hon. Gentleman had had the advice of such a Conference, and if the Council had had the advice of a few independent members of the Indian community to discuss frankly Indian affairs without official bias, many of the scandals which had lately disgraced the annals of the Indian administration would have been avoided. The presence in this country of independent natives competent to convey to the

Secretary of State and his Council the changes that had taken place in Indian opinion would carry immense weight; and would be of great utility in preventing the commission of stupid blunders and arrogant acts of the kind which had been witnessed during the late *régime* in India; and would be a check on any reactionary tendencies on the part of the Government at home. With these few remarks and a general approval of the tendency of the Bill he begged to give it his most cordial support.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry) said he did not rise to speak as a retired Indian civil servant, but to ask the Secretary for India if he could give him any information on two points which had occurred to him. He noticed that the right hon. Gentleman took power under this Bill to repeal the Act of 1876, which gave power to appoint any person possessing special qualifications. He thought it was rather a curious thing to repeal such a power given to a Government. The real point he wished to raise, however, was that in the Act of 1876 a person appointed to the Indian Council held office during good behaviour. and could only be removed on an address of both Houses of Parliament. He could not find in that Act any power for what he might call the temporary suspension of a member of the Indian Council. He did not know whether it was done under that Act or not, but what he wanted to know was whether, if a member were temporarily detached from the Indian Council, it was open to that member of his own initiative to return to the Indian Council without being reappointed thereto by the Secretary of State.

Mr. MORLEY: As I understand the law, it is not within the power of the Secretary of State to reappoint a member of the Council who has once retired from office.

Mr. MOONEY said his point did not refer to a member who retired from the Indian Council, but to the case of a member who was temporarily detached by the Indian Government from the Indian Council. Under such circumstances could the member return to the Council without the consent of the Secretary of State? The correct expression was "temporarily lent."

Mr. MORLEY said he was not aware of any such case, and he thought he would be if any had arisen. If he were right in assuming that the hon. Gentleman had in mind a certain case, he might inform him that he was incorrectly informed.

Mr. MOONEY said there was no concealment about the matter. The case he had in his mind was that of the Under-Secretary for Ireland, who was a Member of the Indian Council when appointed, and did not retire from that body. It was announced in this House that he was to be "temporarily lent" by the Indian Council to the Government of Ireland. What he desired to know was whether a person in that position could go back to the Indian Council of his own initiative without re-appointment by the Secretary for India. Was he free to return simply by expressing a wish to do so?

Mr. MORLEY: Certainly not by expressing any wish. I do not use the words "going back." No appointment can be made except by and with the consent of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MOONEY said that under this Act the number of years during which a member of the council could be absent from India was reduced from ten to five. If a member had temporarily left India for more than five years he took it that, under the Act, he would not be entitled to go back to the council of which he was created a member, and from which he had not been dismissed. He would be in this curious position, that he could not go back unless appointed by the Secretary for India, and the Secretary for India could not appoint him because the period of his absence was more than five years. In this way they were creating a very curious anomaly.

Mr. LUPTON (Sleaford) said he only rose to ask a question from the right hon. Gentleman. He understood that this Bill was introduced partly in consequence of the determination of the right hon. Gentleman to add some natives of India to the Indian Council. But the Bill, as it stood, contained nothing about natives. Was it competent for the right hon. Gentleman to appoint as many as he liked of the new members from amongst the natives of India, or was there a limit? He (Mr. Lupton) had had the advantage, some years ago, of meeting a member of the Indian Council, and he told him a great deal about India. One of the things he said, which struck him very much, was that famines in India were increasing, and were bound to increase still more in virulence and mortality. When he asked him; "What about the famine fund, has that been spent in Afghan wars?" he replied that it had; the Indian Government always used what funds they had got to pay their debts. He (Mr. Lupton) wished to ask if the Government were now advised to use the special famine funds for the payment of expenses incurred in military expeditions?

MR. MORLEY: The last question of the hon. Member is one that does not at all arise here. In reply to the first question, there is nothing in the Bill which at all limits or defines in any way the choice of the Secretary of State. He may appoint Indian members of the council or others.

*SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said he wished to make a few remarks, even at that late hour, because of the extreme importance of the subject, and necessarily few because the Bill had been introduced so very late in the session, and was now being debated very far into the small hours of the morning. He could have wished as they had a great question before them, that the debate could be conducted without any of that asperity which was introduced by his hon. friend near him. It was important when they were dealing with the affairs of India that they should take a high, statesmanlike view, not mere criticism of other Members whose opinions differed. He thought that those opinions were extremely valuable. He agreed entirely with what his hon. friend the Member for Walworth said about the need of having independent persons on the Council of State. He spoke of an independent mind rather than of personal character in these distinguished men. They should have men of varied careers, not merely one sort of officials, but as various and as representative as in that House. It was well known to those serving in India that the administration gained immensely in every way and at every point, and especially in times of peril, when it had competent native advisers on whom it could depend, and he welcomed the belief that this Bill was intended to assist the Secretary of State for India to bring into his Council some of the natives of the country, who were familiar with the opinions and the feelings of the people on many questions, familiar to a degree that no British official —however well-qualified in other respects —could possibly be. The changes the Bill made were likely to do good. It was, on the whole, he thought, well that the tenure of office should be reduced from ten years to seven. He could have wished, however, that they had some certain assurance that natives were going to be introduced into the Council. In fine, he hoped this Bill would pass its Second Reading, while its important details could be discussed in Committee.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) said he wished to emphasise the observations of his hon. friend the Member for Newry. He had pointed out a couple of points at least which were well worth consideration by the Secretary of State for India. He had pointed out that under the Council of India Act, 1876, there was power to appoint a person possessing special qualifications to be a member of the Council. Section 5 of this Bill repealed the Act of 1876. Was it a wise proceeding to deprive the present Secretary of State or any future Government of the power of appointing a person possessing special qualifications? There might not be now on the political horizon a Warren Hastings or a Lord Clive, but there was the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs. The hon. Member was somewhat snobbish, but he put him down with such distinguished predecessors as Warren Hastings and Lord Clive, and they would all be satisfied if he soared in such a starry atmosphere as he had mentioned. He thought it would be an act of the greatest unwisdom for the Government to deprive itself or any other Government of India of the power of availing of the services of such hon. Gentlemen as the Member for Montgomery Boroughs. Now he came to what was proposed by this Bill. The first proposition was to fix the number of members of the Council, and on that he did not intend to trouble the House with any observations. But the second proposition was to reduce the period of possible absence from India before appointment from ten to five years. That affected a very distinguished public servant at the present time. They were not, and the House was not, quite clear as to what were the terms upon which the present Under-Secretary for Ireland retired from the position of a member of the Council of India. His recollection was that his retirement from the Council of India was tentative, that it came upon an invitation of a distinguished member of the late Government for the purpose of assisting him in a difficult situation. He wanted to know if he had altered his position as a member of the Council; was he still an outside member of the Council; did he ever retire from the Council; was his absence from India at present a real absence; was it an absence which would be construed by those who would have the interpretation of this Bill as a period of absence from India of five years or not? These were points they desired to have elucidated before they could with a clear conscience pass this part of the Bill. His hon. friend had raised these two points. He submitted that they were important points. The first was an important point; although he might have treated it in a light manner so far as the hon. Member opposite was concerned. The second question was one which his hon. friend, himself, and others were unable to understand. He did not wish it to be understood—and he was quite sure his hon. and learned friend did not wish it to be understood—that they were expressing any desire for the retirement of Sir A. MacDonnell. Far from it; but he was in Ireland at the invitation of, and had been appointed by, the Government of Ireland, on the understanding, if he remembered rightly, that his position would not be worsened so far as the Government were concerned. Before this Bill was pressed to a final issue, he thought the right hon. Gentleman ought, if he possibly could, to inform the House as to what the real position of the Under-Secretary for Ireland was. It might be that they would be obliged to abstain from voting, while they had a very honest and sincere desire—as they often had—of supporting the Government in the lobby. Then the Secretary of State had referred to the period of absence from India. He said a period of "real" absence. What did that mean? He thought that these two points ought to be elucidated before the House was called upon to come to a final decision on the Bill.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: I beg to ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Tuesday. (*Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

PRISONS (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) (APPLICATION OF PENALTIES) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

SALMON AND FRESHWATER FISHERIES BILL [LORDS].

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes before One o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 6th August, 1907.

The Earl COWLEY took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill; Moved that the order made on the 20th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to; Bill read 2^a accordingly: Committee negatived.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [H.L.]; Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]; Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water Bill [H.L.]; Midland Railway Bill [H.L.]; Commons' Amendments considered and agreed to.

Aberdeen Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 154); A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Aberdeen Harbour: And

Dumbarton Burgh Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 155); A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order relating to Dumbarton Burgh:

Were presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, Section 7) deemed to have been read 2^a, and reported from the Committee.

PETITIONS.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (TONNAGE DEDUCTION FOR PROPELLING POWER) BILL.

Petitions to be heard by Counsel against; of Pilotage Authorities and Pilots of Ports in the Bristol Channel; Swansea Harbour Trustees; Taff Vale Railway Company; and Cardiff Railway Company. Read and ordered to lie on the Table.

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee with further Amendments; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 153.)

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Reported, with an Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

PRISONS (IRELAND) BILL (No. 156).

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) (APPLICATION OF PENALTIES BILL) (No. 157).

Brought from the Commons; Read 1^a, and to be printed.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3^a on Thursday next.

FATAL ACCIDENTS (DAMAGES) BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD **COURTNEY** OF **PENWITH**: My Lords, in view of the important and interesting Bill which awaits your Lordships' consideration this evening, I shall be as brief as possible in explaining the purport of the measure to which I ask the House to give a Second Reading. Your Lordships are aware that before the passing of what is commonly called Lord Campbell's Act the relatives of a person who met with a fatal accident in England through the negligence of another had no right of action against the negligent person. The law of England differs in that respect from the law of Scotland, which in such a case gave a right of action to the next of kin, not only for damages but also for what is described in Scottish law as a solatium for the loss incurred. The law of England being thus altered by Lord Campbell's Act the question of the construction of that statute arose in a case where a person who was killed had insured his life, and the negligent defendants contended that the amount recoverable under the insurance policy ought to be deducted from the damages which might be assessed by the jury; and the jury were directed to deduct the amount so received. That is held to be the law of England to this day in respect to compensation arising in cases of fatal accident through negligence.

The law is different in respect to claims arising from accidents which are not fatal. In the case of an accident which was not fatal an attempt was made, in an action for damages, to get the amount of the insurance policy deducted from the amount of damages otherwise recoverable. That case went to the Court of Exchequer Chamber in 1874, and Lord Bramwell delivered a reasoned judgment against the deduction of the policy money from the damages otherwise recoverable. He argued that the policy was a thing which the person who had entered into it had paid for by his premiums, and that the money he was entitled to receive under it ought in no case to be taken into account in the diminution of damages. It was held that to allow the amount to be so deducted was in fact giving the wrongful person an advantage for which he had no kind of claim. Therefore, the law in England up to this time is that where a person is killed the amount of the insurance money may be deducted from the damages recoverable under Lord Campbell's Act, but that where he is not killed no such deduction is permissible. I think there is a strong argument in favour of making the law of England in respect of fatal accidents the same as in the case of non-fatal accidents, and therefore similar to the law of Scotland.

Parliament has already, in fact, decided in this sense, for as far back as 1864 a railway passengers' insurance company passed a private Bill under which it was provided that in the case of a fatal accident arising in connection with any policy of insurance effected by that company, the damages recoverable by the representatives of the deceased person should not be liable to any deduction on account of any money received under that policy. Two other companies have come to Parliament this year and have obtained Acts of Parliament giving them the same privilege. It is difficult to imagine under what principle the negligent person could claim the advantage of the policy. I might refer your Lordships to a case which arose in Canada, under an Act which, I believe, is identical with Lord Campbell's Act, where an attempt was made to obtain the reduction of money receivable under a policy of insurance from the total amount of damages recoverable in fatal accident. That case came, on appeal, before the Privy Council, who, through the mouth of Lord Watson, practically overruled the construction put upon Lord Campbell's Act; and in the case of Canada, at all events, the sum payable on the death of the deceased under any contract of insurance cannot be deducted. In these circumstances I hope your Lordships will assent to the Second Reading of this Bill, which makes general that which your Lordships' branch of the Legislature sanctioned this session in the case of two private companies.

This anomaly has been brought before my notice as a director of an insurance company, but it appeared to me to be a matter of public interest, and I have not hesitated to bring it to the notice of your Lordships. I observe that the noble Lord opposite, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, has placed on the Paper a dilatory Motion with respect to this Bill, but after what I have said I hope he will not press it. If, however, there is any serious desire for further opportunity for the consideration of the measure I shall have no objection to postpone it. But the matter is so simple that I can recommend it to your Lordships with confidence. I beg to move.

Moved, that the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith*).

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH, who had given notice, on the Motion for the Second Reading, to move to resolve:—

"That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill without more time for the consideration of the subject than is provided between July 31 and August 6."

said: My Lords, as the noble Lord has said, an Amendment with regard to this Bill stands in my name on the Paper. The noble Lord has been good enough to characterise it as a dilatory Motion. The position I desire to adopt is that of an anxious inquirer, and I think that a humble layman like myself has some reason to complain of the length of time which we have been given to consider this Bill. It appeared in print for the first time last Friday; it has not been through the other House of Parliament, and has not, therefore, been discussed, and we have not yet had an opportunity of informing ourselves about it through the usual channels of information. Yesterday was Bank Holiday, and it has been impossible since Friday to get any legal advice from those who generally advise me on such a subject as this, and therefore, as I say, I assume the position of an anxious inquirer. The phraseology of the Bill seems to be very distinct, but it may not tell all its own tale. The Bill provides that—

> "In assessing damages in any action, whether commenced before or after the passing of this Act, under the Fatal Accidents Act, 1846, as amended by any subsequent enactment, there shall not be taken into account any sum paid or payable on the death of the deceased under any contract of assurance or insurance, whether made before or after the passing of this Act."

I confess at once that I am absolutely unable to say what the legal effect of this will be when considered with the long series of Statutes with which it is incorporated. We know quite well that Parliament last year passed a Compensation Act which has involved a great many people in the insurance of their domestic servants. I daresay that was a right thing to do. But is the effect of this Bill to make us not only liable for the insurance which we undertake as a matter of precaution to prevent being cast suddenly in damages under the Act, but also personally liable, and is the insurance not to be taken into account in the compensation to be awarded? The noble Lord, I see, dissents from that view. I can only say, if I am wrong, that I raise the point because, owing to the extreme shortness of the time, I have not had an opportunity of ascertaining what the precise legal effect of the Bill would be. I am entirely in the hands of the legal Members of your Lordships' House. If they say that under all the circumstances this is a proper Bill to pass, I will, with the leave of the House, withdraw my notice. But the noble Lord in his speech revealed to the House the fact that in more than one case the provision sought to be enacted by this Bill has been given to certain insurance companies by private Bill. That seems to me a sufficiently astonishing thing. I thought it was one of the canons of private Bill legislation that private Bills were not to override general Acts of Parliament. I am informed that not only has that been done this year, but that there is at least one precedent in previous years. I believe it was done this year by a Committee over which Lord Ribblesdale presided. I am informed that, in allowing the clause, the Committee stated that it had been impressed upon them that an alteration of this character in the general law should be made. If they knew that this was altering the general law I submit that they committed an error of procedure and should not have allowed the clause: and I am surprised that the guardians of the House should have permitted that clause to pass without calling attention to it. The insurance law on a point of this kind should be universal. This Bill effects a grave alteration in the general law, and I do not know, of course, what chance it may have in another place. It is ostensibly a private Member's Bill here, but there are facilities for what are called "starring" a measure in another place; and if your Lordships, without due consideration, give your consent to the Bill, it would not be safe to do so relying upon its being carefully examined in the other House, because, under the conditions one sees prevailing there, it may slip through in the small hours of the morning without any adequate notice, or, at any rate, discussion.

Moved to resolve, "That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill without more time for consideration of the subject than is provided between the 31st of July and the 6th of August."—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I confess I regard this Bill with very great suspicion, and I think it requires considerable discussion at the hands of your Lordships. If the noble Lord will allow me I will point out to him the reason for the law as it was laid down, and show how entirely inapplicable it is to the question we are at present discussing. There was a collision between two vessels, the injured vessel being insured, and it was laid down that the amount receivable in respect of the policy of insurance could not properly be deducted, but upon this ground—that it was an act of negligence which caused the damage. The point was that the negligent owner had no right to the deduction of money received under a private contract. Accordingly, the insurance money could not be deducted from the amount of damages recoverable by the owner of the injured ship. I am rather startled to find that decision put forward to justify a Bill applying the principle to a person who, for instance, has effected an insurance at his own expense for the express purpose of protecting himself against damages which his servant might recover. As I read this Bill, you will not be able to deduct the fund you have yourself created when you are sued by your servant in respect of injury suffered by him.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: It only applies to proceedings under Lord Campbell's Act.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: This is not a contract made by the injured man himself, but by the employer for his own protection. With what justice can it be said that that sum is not to be deducted from the damages recoverable? It seems to me to be a very unjust proceeding, and, so far as I can see, there is no ground whatever for it.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I think there has been a misunderstanding. In 1846 an Act, called Lord Campbell's Act, was passed, under which the relatives of a person who had been killed by the negligence of another were for the first time entitled to recover damages. It was then held that if the person who was killed had been insured, say, for £1,000, when the jury were disposed to give, say, £2,000 damages, they were bound to deduct the £1,000 for which he was insured, giving thus a verdict for £1,000. That seemed to me unfair, because the person who had committed the wrong was receiving the benefit of the providence of the person injured. The purpose of this Bill is to provide that in such a case as I have instanced, the insurance should not be taken into account by the jury. Moreover, the privilege of non-deduction has been given by private Acts to several insurance companies, and it is desirable that there should be uniformity. His Majesty's Government are in favour of the Bill and will support it, and I sincerely hope there will be no division on the Second Reading.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I only rise in view of the statement which was made by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, that he was surprised that a Committee of your Lordships' House had allowed a private Bill to make an alteration in the general law. Private Bills frequently have this effect; and to lay it down that private Bills should not make alterations in the general law is a new doctrine, and one that could not be substantiated without giving rise to great inconvenience.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I think it better, after what has been said, not to occupy the time of the House by dividing; but the Bill will require further consideration at a subsequent stage. I therefore withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, it sometimes is a useful and desirable course, in approaching the reconsideration of a subject of long-standing controversy, and about which, therefore, the prejudices of both parties have to some extent clustered, to inquire whether there is any common ground of agreement, and, if so, what that common ground is. I think that method may be usefully applied to this subject and to the Evicted Tenants Bill, to which I am asking your Lordships to give a Second Reading. There is surely some common ground between us all on this subject. There is, if not an absolutely universal, yet a very general desire, by no means confined to one side of the House, that some considerable number at any rate of the evicted tenants should be restored to their holdings or obtain other holdings. I need not labour that point. It was made clear from the legislation of 1903 that such was the opinion of the then Government. The Government of that day went a little further. It did not desire to inquire too closely into the actual merits of the particular evicted tenants. I need not quote any of the statements of Mr. Wyndham to that effect; they have been quoted in this House before. But your Lordships will remember that he used in this connection the phrase that by-gones ought to be by-gones, and that it was not wise to stop to inquire from what reason, and under what circumstances the evicted tenants had lost their holdings.

Here, then, is a certain amount of common ground; and on our side we are most freely willing to admit that this proposed legislation is of an exceptional character, and that its provisions, if they do not actually need defence, at any rate need most adequate explanation. I had hoped, my Lords, that there would be a further ground of agreement in regard to the urgency of this matter. Certainly, anybody who read the Report of the Land Conference in the early part of 1903, will, I think, have gained the impression that those representing the landlords were convinced that this part of the question was particularly urgent. Consequently, we on this side of the House were disappointed when a week or two ago the noble Earl opposite, Lord Donoughmore, devoted an elaborate and ingenious argument to endeavouring to show that the case of the evicted tenants was no more urgent than that of the ordinary tenant purchaser in Ireland. He seemed to regard with perfect equanimity the possibility that the case of the evicted tenants might hang on as long as any transactions were taking place under the Land Act of 1903.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: *Pari passu* was my phrase.

THE EARL OF CREWE: Well, *pari passu* would involve the possibility that some of the last transactions might be those connected with evicted tenants. I admit that to those who know nothing of Ireland the deep interest taken in the evicted tenants may come somewhat of a surprise. If the same set of circumstances had arisen here in England, we should, perhaps, have taken a somewhat harsher view. We should have said that after all, these people were the victims of circumstances, of a great quarrel between different interests connected with the land, and that such a quarrel was bound to have its victims for whom nothing could be done. We might have repeated the old saying, "Hard cases make bad law"—an aphorism which is very comforting to everybody except the hard cases.

But whether it is that Irishmen are more generous, or more emotional, there can be no question that the case of the evicted tenants has sunk very deeply into the hearts of Irishmen as a body. I hope nobody will say that the agitation on their behalf has been anything in the nature of a political manœuvre, because I do not believe that would be true. In the first place, for the mere purpose of political agitation all the time and energy and money that has been expended on behalf of the evicted tenants by the Irish Nationalist Party might have been far more fruitfully expended. In the next place, the interest in the evicted tenants is by no means confined to those who are engaged in pushing forward the Nationalist propaganda. The case of the evicted tenants does come home to a number of quiet people in Ireland, who are not specially concerned with politics, and, for all I know, may not be particularly interested in the National cause.

Now, my Lords, I come to the Bill which is before the House, and the first point to note in it is that Clause 1 gives compulsory powers for the acquisition of land for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants, or for providing other farms for what are called the new tenants, of whom I shall have a word to say later on. Not long after the Estates Commissioners had begun their labours they applied to have some special assistance from the Treasury in order to increase their staff and to deal with these particular cases and kindred cases. That addition to their staff was refused, and it was refused on the ground that these transactions were secondary to the main purpose of the Act, which was to carry out purchase by agreement, and that therefore it was only in cases where the reinstatement of evicted tenants was part of the transaction of the purchase of an estate that the Commissioners ought to proceed to carry it through. The Estates Commissioners took a different view. They thought, holding, I suppose, that the Land Act of 1903 represented not merely an economic transaction but a pacifying influence, that it was advantageous to deal as promptly as possible with the difficult cases of this kind, and not to take them merely, to use the noble Earl's words, *pari passu* with the simple and easy cases under which large estates changed hands by the method of agreement.

The Estates Commissioners were, however, overruled, and in July, 1905, regulations were issued forbidding the carrying out of transactions in favour of the evicted tenants except as part of the sale of estates as a whole. Many of these regulations were cancelled in February of last year, and whereas in the first two years and four months of the operation of that Act only 387 evicted tenants were restored, in one year and four months subsequent to the cancellation of the regulations 646 evicted tenants were either restored or obtained new farms. It may be asked, then why do the Government wish to introduce the method of compulsion? There are several answers to that question. In the first place, the hope of proceeding further by voluntary appeal is pretty well exhausted. The owners of nearly 200 farms have refused, as they had, of course, a perfectly legal right to do, to enter into any negotiations with the Commissioners for the reinstatement of evicted tenants. There is the further fact that the Estates Commissioners did not find it possible to obtain by agreement land for farms for evicted tenants in some of the localities where they were particularly needed.

There have been other cases of a different kind, in which an agreement might possibly be arrived at, but the landlords, desiring to sell the whole of their estate, have declined to reinstate evicted tenants unless the particular terms on which they wish to sell the estate as a whole are agreed to by the other tenants; that is to say, not to put too fine a point on it, that a screw has been put on the tenants of an estate as a whole by means of the desire that a very small number of evicted tenants should be restored. Consequently in our opinion this machinery of compulsion is needed, even although, as we hope, it may not be very often used in practice.

Then it is said there is a great deal of untenanted land in Ireland which presumably might be secured by agreement, and why not take over a sufficient amount of that land for this purpose? Here, again, there are one or two matters to be considered. Some of this untenanted land will, we hope, in the future be used, as it certainly is wanted, for making holdings which are now uneconomic into economic holdings. In the second place, there have been a certain number of cases where, if not fancy prices, at any rate very full prices indeed, have been asked for untenanted land. The statement has been made—I do not know what colour there is for it—that the Estates Commissioners are a body of people who do not hold that a fair price ought to be given for untenanted land. I can only say that in any observations of theirs which have been published—and I think I have read all the published observations they have made—I find nothing which can justify such an observation as that. On the contrary, it has been their expressed view—a view which is shared by all reasonable people, I should think, in both countries—that it is impossible to ask or expect landlords to part with their land unless they obtain a reasonable price for it.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that the Estates Commissioners have to depend upon the reports of their inspectors as to what the value of land is, and, as a matter of fact, where they have altered the figures arrived at by the inspectors, it has almost always been in the direction of giving a larger price than the inspectors would themselves have named. But it has to be borne in mind what the liability of the Commissioners is in this respect. If they pay an excessive price for land, higher, that is to say, than can possibly be met by the annuities when the land is distributed among the tenants, the difference has to be found by a very easily exhausted fund, the Guarantee Fund, or, failing that, it has to be made up out of the rates. In these circumstances it is necessary for the Estates Commissioners to exercise great caution to avoid paying an excessive price, and it has to be remembered that the price which the tenants in some cases might be willing to give is not necessarily a fair price. I am afraid there is still quite enough land hunger in Ireland for people to offer, on the spur of the moment, to pay rents by way of annuity which are not justified by the economic conditions; and that is a further reason why great caution has to be exercised by the Commissioners.

As to the procedure for acquiring this land, the point in Clause 2 which interests noble Lords opposite is that there is no appeal from the decision of the Estates Commissioners except upon a point of law. It is desirable, in considering this subject, to know what the positive proposition is in contradiction to that which appears in the Bill. What is suggested as the substitute for the clause as it stands in our measure? I think I am right in saying that if you substitute for the clause in the Bill the provision of the Lands Clauses Acts as they apply to Ireland, you will bring in a jury; and trial by jury in Ireland has not always, I am afraid, had the best repute. I think I am justified in assuming that noble Lords opposite do not desire to leave the value of the untenanted lands to be assessed by a jury. Then, again, would noble Lords opposite prefer an arbitrator appointed by the Government? My right hon. friend in another place put that question to an hon. Member who was discussing the matter, and that hon. Gentleman hurriedly disclaimed any desire of that kind. The real difficulty is this, that when you come to the question of an appeal in a matter of this kind, you find yourselves appealing from a body of people who know most of the subject to a body of people who know least, and that is likely to happen whatever body you select. I do not see how it can be disputed that so far as knowledge of the subject is concerned, you will not find any people in Ireland with more experience and knowledge than the three gentlemen who sit as the Estates Commissioners. Of course, noble Lords opposite may say that knowledge is not everything, and that is a point which they are perfectly entitled to make. But I will not dwell any further on this point at present. I desire to wait, assuming that noble Lords opposite will produce some Amendment on that clause. I can assure noble Lords that any suggestion they may make for an appellate tribunal will receive our very careful consideration.

Clause 3 carries out the provisions of the Bill with regard to the new tenants mentioned in the first clause. These new tenants are tenants who hold evicted farms, and by the provisions of the Bill they may in certain circumstances, if they leave those farms, be compensated either in money or in land. This is a matter upon which, from one point of view, we should all, I think, find ourselves in agreement. If the Estates Commissioners and noble Lords opposite and ourselves were to meet and discuss the claims of a particular tenant who now holds a former evicted farm to remain there, supposing he desired to do so, we should probably be in pretty close agreement as to his claim in any individual case after we had carefully examined the circumstances. But there is—noble Lords must forgive me for saying so—a certain degree of irony in this matter, irony which so often crops up in relation to Irish history and Irish politics. Here are noble Lords opposite standing up, almost with tears in their eyes, for a sacred right of fixity of tenure, and one cannot help wishing that they or their forbears during the last thirty years had held similar views as to the fixity of tenure of Irish tenants. It all depends upon the moral claim of a particular tenant. Where a new tenant, or planter, has taken one of these evicted farms and is farming it well, and especially if he has improved the land, we must all agree that his claim to retain it, if he so desires, is a strong one. We have shown what our view is, because we have not attempted to disturb any tenant of this kind who has purchased his holding.

*Lord ASHBOURNE: It is open at present under the Bill unless sub-guarded.

The Earl of CREWE: I beg the noble and learned Lord's pardon.

The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: What is the clause which prevents it?

*Lord ASHBOURNE: It may be legal at present under the Bill. Mr. Birrell said, I think, it is left to the discretion of the Estates Commissioners, but they would not exercise it.

The Earl of CREWE: Perhaps the noble and learned Lord will raise the point later, and I will reply then. I ask your Lordships to consider the opposite case—the case of an evicted tenant whose family had for generations held a particular holding, and that holding may now be in the possession of a man who is, perhaps, little more than a bailiff, so far as his personal interest in the holding is concerned. In such a case as that there should be little doubt that the evicted tenant had a strong moral claim to be reinstated. Between those two extremes there are a variety of cases in which the balance of moral claim is difficult to adjust. In some cases I admit it may be exceedingly difficult to decide which way the scales rise or fall. How are you going in an Act of Parliament to define the relative weight of these claims? If you do not allow any of these particular evicted tenants to be restored owing to the fact that their farms are occupied, you undoubtedly run the risk of leaving this important side of the question unsettled. The cases in which the claims of the new tenants could not be met by an equivalent grant of land, or by a money grant, are exceedingly few.

Clause 5 makes provision for loss on resales, which I think will not be serious, and Clause 6 gives a very proper protection to the landowners. Clause 9 relieves restored tenants from any loss through any grant made to them for stocking their farm being taken for debts formerly incurred. That is, no doubt, an unusual provision, but I think it is one which on the whole must be agreed to be a reasonable one. The State advances a certain sum of money for a particular purpose, and it is entitled to decide the conditions upon which that money is to be paid; otherwise the Bill would become a Bill for the payment of old debts. It must further be remembered that the creditors are not, so to speak, altogether out of it, because the tenant is by this grant placed in a position in which he may be, and ought to be, able to pay off in time such debts as those mentioned in the clause.

I do not think I need dwell on any other clause until I come to Clause 13, that which has to do with the tenure of office of the Estates Commissioners. There seems to have been some confusion in the minds of many people as to what the position of the Estates Commissioners really is. There has been a tendency to regard them as purely administrative officers, who ought to receive their orders from the Government of the day, and who are not entitled to give a judicial opinion, or exercise any judicial function. Mr. Justice Meredith, in the case of the Scottish Union Estate, said the fact was sometimes overlooked that the Estates Commissioners were Land Commissioners, and exercised all the powers and duties of a Land Commissioner, and, of course, duties of a judicial and semi judicial character were exercised by the Land Commissioners. The effect of this provision in Clause 13 is to leave the Estates Commissioners fully subject to Parliamentary criticism, but it does relieve them from a possibility of their being subjected to Party pressure. I make no charge against any Party, and I dare say noble Lords could imagine circumstances in which either one Party or the other might be disposed to put undue pressure on the Estates Commissioners. We believe this to be a very valuable provision, and we hope your Lordships will not attempt to disturb it.

The complaint against this measure is that it leaves far too wide and large a discretion to the Commissioners. They might, it is almost hinted, buy up all the land in Ireland under compulsory powers and distribute it at their will and pleasure, and it is suggested, therefore that the Bill ought to be subject to a limit of time, a limit of area or acreage, and a limit of numbers. It is only on this last point that I desire to say one word. I sincerely hope that your lordships will not insert a limit of numbers. It is perfectly obvious that no limitation which is inserted in Parliament can give the precise number of tenants who ought to be reinstated. If the number inserted were too low, and you did not reinstate those who, it is agreed, ought to be reinstated, you would leave a very real and substantial grievance. On the other hand, if you fix the limit too high, it is likely to be taken, not as a maximum, but as a standard, and if the Estates Commissioners find that they do not wish to reach that limit because there really are not enough deserving tenants to be reinstated, you will have a grievance of a different kind—not a substantial grievance, but what is supposed to be a grievance; because it will be said that Parliament decided that so many ought to be reinstated, and therefore there are, so to speak, a certain number of places vacant in your concert hall which you are not taking the trouble to fill up. I hope, therefore, that no limitation of numbers will be inserted in the Bill.

Then there is one further observation I should like to make. We fully admit that this measure must stand on its own merits as a measure devised to meet a particular difficulty. Noble Lords opposite may be afraid that this measure is to be regarded as a precedent for dealing with all the remaining land in Ireland. It is considered as the thin edge of the wedge. It cannot be the thin end of the wedge because we say there is no wedge.

A NOBLE LORD: What is it?

THE EARL OF CREWE: What noble Lords, I suppose, are afraid of is that, when Lord Dudley's Commission has reported, we shall immediately proceed to apply this Bill to the remaining land of Ireland. There is this difference between the two cases, that whatever that Commission recommends will be purely an economic recommendation. This measure, as we fully admit, is only very partially economic, and is mainly political. Anything proposed in consequence of that Commission's Report must also, like this Bill, stand on its own merits, and we shall not, in any conclusions we may arrive at when we receive that Report, pray this Act—as I hope it will be—in aid, or found upon it arguments for dealing with land under different circumstances.

I hope that the discussion which will ensue upon this Bill will be of a business character. It is almost too much to hope, I suppose, that a Bill relating to Ireland and proposed from this side of the House will pass through without some denunciation of somebody by noble Lords from Ireland. What I do hope is that if there is to be denunciation it will be denunciation of his Majesty's Government. We freely offer ourselves for that purpose. Our predatory instincts are well known. Brigandage is our daily pastime, and confiscation is our daily bread. We have heard all that before, and I am sure we shall hear it very often again; but I hope that denunciation will be confined to us, and that it will not be extended to this particular class of farmers in Ireland, who may not always have acted discreetly or well, but who, at any rate, have taken part in transactions where the fault was not always on one side, and who certainly have suffered the pain of hope long deferred. I hope also that there will be no denunciation of public servants who are labouring hard in Ireland and doing their duty there according to the best of their lights. I hope, in conclusion, that your Lordships will take the Bill as it is, dealing with it, of course, as you think best, but refraining from reading into its provisions any prejudices or fears under which some people in Ireland may labour; and that we shall achieve one more step in what I admit to be the very tedious march towards a final settlement of the Irish land question.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Earl of Crewe*).

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I feel sure that on this side of the House, at any rate, we appreciate the courtesy and the moderation of the speech in which the noble Earl has moved the Second Reading of this Bill. I certainly do not rise to take advantage of the permission which he gave us a moment ago to denounce him and his colleagues in violent language. The noble Earl, in a passage with a fine vein of humour in it, suggested that noble Lords opposite might have it imputed to them that brigandage was their daily pastime. May we, perhaps, say of the Lord President of the Council that

> "He is the mildest manner'd man
> That ever scuttled ship."

But I must add that he scuttles the ship all same. The noble Lord admitted that this Bill contains provisions which are exceptional and need explanation. That is, I believe, a very gentle way of putting it. I would go the length of saying that this Bill contains provisions for a parallel of which you might search in vain the Statute-book of this country or of any part of the British Empire.

What are the pretexts which are alleged in defence of these exceptional measures? They are first, that there are in Ireland a large number of victims of a harsh system, who have been thrust out of their farms not entirely for any fault of their own, and who are anxiously awaiting reinstatement. We are told, secondly, that we on this side of the House were parties in 1903 to a compromise of some kind, part of which was a measure of reinstatement—I will not say the same as this Bill, but a measure corresponding in some degree to the proposals of his Majesty's Government. I venture to say that both of those allegations are of a somewhat fanciful description, and have very little correspondence with the facts of the case. I must be allowed to remind your Lordships of that which actually did take place in 1903, because it was out of the legislation of 1903 that this evicted tenants question, as we now know it, undoubtedly grew.

In 1903 there emerged on all sides a feeling that the time had come when a resolute effort should be made to bring to an end the intolerable system of land tenure which successive Acts had fastened on owners and occupiers of the soil in Ireland. We believed that that system could be brought to an end only by some great system of purchase. Let me remind your Lordships that the present system of tenure in Ireland has been condemned on all sides and by all whose business it has been to inquire into it. Some of your Lordships may have forgotten the memorable Report of the Committee of this House, presided over in the year 1883 by Lord Cairns. Every word that was said in Lord Cairns's Report was confirmed fifteen years afterwards by that well-known Royal Commission presided over by Sir Edward Fry—a Commission, remember, which included amongst its members Mr. Cherry, the highest authority on Irish Land Tenure and one of your law officers.

The Report of the Fry Commission condemned the system which it found in existence on the ground of the insufficient qualification and insufficient independence of the officials by whom these rent-fixing operations were carried out. They referred to the universal suspicions, not confined to the landlords, with which the sub-commissioners and valuers were regarded; they pointed out that the appeal, as provided by the Act, was an illusory appeal; and they dwelt, in words which cannot be too much taken to heart, upon the unrest and demoralisation created by the existence of this system throughout Ireland. We thought that the time had come for trying to bring that system to an end, and with the co-operation of representatives, both of the landlords and of the tenants, we were able to frame the Land Purchase Act of 1903. Those who were responsible for that measure all desired that, if there was to be a settlement, that settlement should be a complete one, and that, to use an often-used phrase, it should leave no open sores behind. The Bill was accordingly so framed that, in connection with and incidental to a system of sale and purchase, there should be a plan for reinstating evicted tenants so far as circumstances permitted.

The Bill passed, and the policy at first proved to be eminently satisfactory. Sales proceeded apace, so did reinstatements, and it would scarcely be too much to say that for the first time for many years something like a hope of a termination of a condition of things which every one regretted appeared upon the political horizon. With the advent of the new Government a great change came over the situation in Ireland. The language used by Ministers indicated from the very first that it was their intention to tamper with the settlement of 1903. They used language which could not fail to disturb the minds both of those tenants who had actually purchased their holdings and of those who were intending to purchase; and not only did they use such language, but they actually gave a Second Reading to a Bill uprooting the whole basis of the Act of 1903, and profoundly altering the law of land tenure in Ireland, forgetting that there is no greater obstacle that you can put in the way of purchase than a disturbance or a revision of the conditions of land tenure.

Now comes this Bill—a new and formidable element of disturbance. Let me say, in the first place, one word upon the question of the number of people whom it will affect. We know that four years ago those best able to judge estimated the number of evicted tenants who might be dealt with at somewhere about 400; we know that at this moment something like 8,000 applications have come before His Majesty's Government. That figure is the measure of the expectations which the language of His Majesty's Ministers has raised in the minds of the people of Ireland. We are told that of those 8,000 applicants 2,000 only, or about 2,000, are considered worthy of reinstatement. We have had no explanation from His Majesty's Ministers of the reasons for this immense increase in the number, and we have been wholly unable to elicit from them any kind of definition of the tests which they intend to adopt when deciding which of these men are worthy of being put back on their farms and which are not. I do not believe that the Irish Government will be able to defend this frontier of 2,000, which they have laid down for their own guidance. It is an arbitrary frontier, and it is not one which I believe for a moment they will be able to hold. We are told—I think the noble Earl used the expression—that bygones should be bygones.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I quoted Mr. Wyndham's expression.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I will take it either from the noble Earl or from Mr. Wyndham. It is a good expression. I should like bygones to be bygones, but I want to know a little about some of the bygones with which you are going to deal under this Bill. Do not let us allow ourselves to forget that since the year 1881 no tenant in Ireland has lost his farm by eviction unless he has brought that eviction upon himself. That may sound a strong thing to say, but I believe it to be perfectly true. Since the Act of 1881 the Irish tenant has had the right to have a fair rent fixed, a rent which has always been very much below that which the farm would command in the open market. He has also had the great privilege of free sale. The noble Marquess opposite, who remembers the debates which took place at the time of the Land Bill of 1881, will recollect that the great recommendation of the right of free sale was this, that it was supposed to provide an automatic measure of relief for every tenant who found himself in difficulties. He could sell his tenant right, and he was replaced by a man better able to do justice to the farm. The tenants have had fair rents; they have had the privilege of free sale; and they have also had the opportunity of making a composition for their arrears upon terms of the most generous and attractive description. Does it not follow that these people who have lost their holdings must have lost them either because they were incompetent farmers, or owing to the ordinary vicissitudes to which agriculture in all parts of the United Kingdom is exposed, or because they have deliberately preferred to take part in a dangerous agitation, and to allow themselves to be evicted rather than take advantage of the legitimate opportunities which were offered to them? It is to these men, who have had these great opportunities placed within their reach, that you are going to offer the extraordinary terms proposed in this Bill.

I ask your Lordships to consider for one moment how this Bill will operate. It may happen that the owner of an estate may have had his rents regularly paid by a quiet, law-observing body of tenants. There may have been a single one of them who has, for one reason or another, chosen to resist rent payment and been evicted. That man, under this Bill, can be restored to his holding, can be put back in the middle of the estate, and not put back on a level of equality with the other tenants but put back under conditions which, if the other tenants pay, let us say, 10s. an acre for their land, enable him to get his land for 7s. 6d. per acre. Can one conceive a more demoralising example to set in a country where even its best friends must admit moral courage and self-reliance are not always as conspicuous as they might be?

Then I come for one moment to the *modus operandi*. The noble Earl has explained to us that in order to find farms for these gentlemen you are to oust the people who are described in the Bill as new tenants, but who are best known to us as "planters." Noble Lords opposite are progressing rapidly. Four years ago even the Nationalist leaders were ready to admit that planters deserved to be protected. The noble Earl opposite held decided language upon this subject in your Lordships' House. I remember very well that a noble friend of mine, Lord Westmeath, moved an Amendment which was intended to protect the planters even against the voluntary sale of their holdings. Upon that occasion I find that I ventured to express the opinion, first, that the planters, who were sturdy and resolute gentlemen, were not very likely to make way for others; secondly, that I did not believe that the Land Commission would lend itself to such a transaction; and, thirdly, that I did not believe the Irish Government would for a moment allow these men to be sacrificed in the manner which was supposed. The noble Earl opposite supported my view, and told us that in his opinion it would be a monstrous thing if planter tenants who were genuine and reputable farmers were disturbed. The noble Earl has said something of the same kind this evening, and I hope that when the moment comes, as it will come, when on this side of the House we shall move an Amendment designed to protect these genuine and reputable farmers, the noble Earl will give us his support. He dwelt a few moments ago upon the great difficulty of discovering a formula which would include these particular people and not others whom it might be undesirable to include. I have an idea that we shall be able to draft a rather useful clause by adopting the very words of the noble Earl, and we may have to appeal to him for help when we come to the Committee stage on those grounds.

Then we are constantly told that this power of evicting planters is aimed, not at the genuine *bona-fide* planter tenants, but at people who are described as approximating to the *status* of caretakers and so on. I have my doubts about that, and for this reason. Is it not clear that if these men are occupying their land merely as birds of passage and caretakers you will not require the power of compulsory eviction to get rid of them. If you offer them a better or as good a farm elsewhere, or an adequate sum of money, your caretaker will be glad to accept and go. This power of compulsion, I am afraid, is aimed at the very men who have firmly established themselves on their holdings, who have taken root there, and whom you are going to disturb in order to admit much less deserving men from a distance. Why, I would ask, is it necessary to disturb the planters at all? You tell us that you want about 80,000 acres to find room for the evicted tenants, and we are informed that the Estates Commissioners actually have 80,000 acres in sight. They are in treaty for these 80,000 acres and will get them without difficulty. But following on that—I am quoting from the Report of the Estates Commissioners—is the extraordinary statement by the Commissioners that this land is not to be available for the purpose of putting evicted tenants upon it because the great bulk of the land, if ultimately acquired—

> "is needed for the enlargement of small holdings in the localities in which the land is situated, and the people of these localities would strongly object to the whole or even a considerable portion of the land being set aside to meet the requirements of the evicted tenants alone; nor is it probable that the evicted tenants themselves would be willing to take land at a distance from their former holdings and in localities where their introduction would be met by local opposition."

Unless I misunderstood him, the noble Earl accepted and made his own a considerable part of that argument. I would ask your Lordships, were there ever people who had less right to be fastidious in the choice of the land to which they were to be restored than these evicted tenants? They have *ex concessus* neglected the opportunities which were within their reach and have preferred to be evicted. So that it comes to this—on the one side are men who, in order to help you in resisting what has been described by the highest authority as an illegal conspiracy, have, at great personal risk, taken holdings, probably in a somewhat derelict condition, and settled upon them and improved them; and on the other hand you have—whom?—either these evicted tenants or the occupiers of those uneconomic holdings of whom we heard it said the other evening that they were watching with covetous eyes the rich grazing lands adjoining their holdings, and that their natural desire to be furnished with parts of those lands might be accepted, as an extenuating circumstance in connection with the Roscommon cattle drives. It really comes to this, that men, who are in every way deserving of your support, are to be turned out in order to put in their places either National Leaguers or cattle drivers from Roscommon. I must say that that seems to me to be a proposal which I can scarcely find words to characterise.

Consider, moreover, what will be the fate of these evicted planters when you move them to other parts of Ireland. In the passage which I have just quoted we were warned that the introduction of strangers would be likely to meet with local opposition. We have been told over and over again that there is nothing that the tenant farmers of Ireland dislike so much as the introduction of strangers from outside. But if they dislike a stranger, with what feeling will they regard the planter? The planter is something more than a stranger. He is a man who has been denounced, who has been held up to public execration as an individual who should be shunned like a leper and be denied all neighbourly treatment and recognition. What sort of a reception are these men likely to obtain? We have had some reference to the evidence given by the Estates Commissioners before Lord Dudley's Commission. I wonder if your attention has been attracted by the remarkable statement made the other day by Mr. Commissioner Finucane on this subject. Mr. Finucane admitted, in his evidence, that strangers were not very popular. He said—

> "The objection was due to a narrow parochial feeling which he thought might be overcome by tact and persuasion."

And then he went on to say—

> "If these fail I would have no hesitation in putting down selfish opposition by the aid of law and the police."

He was then asked by a member of the Commission whether he thought many tenants would be likely to migrate under police protection; and he replied—

> "Certainly I think they would."

Can one be surprised that Sir Anthony MacDonnell, one of the Commissioners, interpolated this observation—

> "I who have to work the police look forward with great pleasure to this Arcadia."

We shall certainly move Amendments designed to meet the case of the *bona-fide* planters.

I have spoken of compulsion on the tenants. May I say one word with regard to the question of compulsion on the landlords? The case of the landlord from whom land is to be compulsorily taken is, no doubt, less hard than that of the evicted planter; because the landlord does not lose his house and his holding; but, on the other hand, let it not be forgotten that untenanted land in the landlord's possession is absolutely his own. He owns both the landlord's interest and the tenant's interest. It may always have been in his own occupation or he may have acquired it by buying up the tenant right, submitting willingly, perhaps, to a money sacrifice in order to relieve some little fraction of his property from the incubus of Land Court legislation. He may never have evicted a tenant in his life; his relations with his tenants may have been of the most friendly description; yet to him enter the Estates Commissioners and put down in the midst of his property one of these men imported from outside. He may be a planter. The landlord is probably fortunate if he should be a planter. He may be, on the other hand, a man deeply steeped in agitation, whose presence cannot fail to be a disturbing and demoralising element in the whole neighbourhood. We are used in this country to the idea of applying compulsory powers, but I must say it does seem to me to be straining the use of compulsion to apply it for purposes such as those which I have tried to describe.

Then one word as to the machinery of compulsion. As the noble Earl has told us, the preliminary investigations are carried on by the inspectors, who are the *employés* and agents of the Estates Commissioners, and upon whom the Estates Commissioners must necessarily depend. These gentlemen will, I suppose, be of the same class and standing as the sub-Commissioners who are now employed throughout Ireland to fix rents. Many of them, we know, are themselves tenant farmers, and many of them hold their appointments under a temporary tenure, coming within the description which I quoted just now from the Fry Commission. We were told by one of the Estates Commissioners, during his examination the other day, that these temporarily employed officials contract and expand in accordance with the demands of the times. We have had lately a rather striking illustration of one of these contractions and expansions in accordance with the demands of the times. I do not think I shall be corrected when I say that a few months ago eleven, or thereabouts, of these sub-Commissioners were deprived of their appointments, not, I believe, for any fault that was alleged against them—I am told, on the contrary, that their work had met with the approval of the Land Commission—and for them were substituted eleven other gentlemen, of whom I do not want to say a word disrespectful, but who notoriously are men of extreme political views, and whose appointment was welcomed enthusiastically by the Nationalist Press in Ireland, on the ground that they were men of extreme political views and were likely to give effect to those views in their new sphere of action.

Then we come to the Estates Commissioners. With them will rest the final decision in these important cases. It will be for them to decide whether a particular individual is worthy of reinstatement, whether he should be reinstated upon this or that particular plot of ground, and upon these terms or those. There is no appeal. My Lords, I am not going to say anything disrespectful of the Estates Commissioners; they are no doubt able men. I confess, however, that this proposal does seem to me to be one of a very novel and a very improper character, and I will tell your Lordships why. Without imputing anything against the Estates Commissioners, I must point out that they are really themselves parties to the litigation which will go on under the Bill. They are men who are largely the authors of this policy and most interested in making it a success. They are saturated with the strongest ideas as to the manner in which this land question should be dealt with. I do not see in the tone and temper of their evidence anything which can properly be described as characterised by a really judicial frame of mind. I think, indeed, that my case is almost proved by the language of the Bill itself, for in Section 7 it is laid down that for certain purposes the Estates Commissioners—

"shall be deemed to be the promoters of the undertaking."

Yet it is these men, who are promoters throughout, that you propose to turn into a final Court of Appeal. Surely it cannot be right that one and the same body should find, not only what, in the inelegant language of these controversies is described as the "ginger," but also the Judge.

Perhaps I shall be asked whether it is our intention to move that the compulsory clauses of the Bill should be struck out. I recognise so fully that compulsion is an essential feature of this Bill, and I feel so bound to accept what the noble Earl has told us as to his belief that in certain cases it would be impossible to do what is wanted without compulsion, that I prefer not to vote against compulsion, but rather to endeavour by the Amendments which we shall add to the Bill to render the exercise of compulsion less liable to abuse than it is, I believe, in the Bill as it stands. I hope that when the Bill leaves this House it will be in such a shape that no compulsion will be possible unless it has been clearly established, first, that there is a sufficient case for reinstatement; secondly, that voluntary means have been tried unsuccessfully; and, thirdly, that the terms offered are really just and equitable. We, at any rate, cannot look forward to the passing of this Bill unless there is added to it some arrangement which will give us a competent Court of Appeal, by which I mean a Court of Appeal empowered to deal not only with questions of law but questions of fact, and composed of men as far as possible removed from that atmosphere of enthusiasm and excitement in which these Estates Commissioners have their being. I will only add this, that I believe that no one would be more grateful than the Estates Commissioners themselves if they were relieved of this very onerous and difficult function.

I have dealt with what seem to me the most glaring defects of the Bill, but there are several other clauses which we desire to criticise. I will only mention as clauses which seem to me to require alteration that in which power is given to the Estates Commissioners to sell land at a loss and then to charge the amount lost upon the Land Purchase Aid Fund; then there is the clause making a change in the tenure of the Estates Commissioners, and, next, the total absence in the Bill of any provisions tending to fix the limit of its operation, either in regard to time, money, or numbers. We must admit that it is a most extraordinary and exceptional Bill. Surely some trouble should be taken to render this transitionary state of things temporary and terminable, and that Ireland should not be left, say for ten years, seething under the friction and agitation to which clauses of this Bill are likely to give rise. The noble Earl made use of a very striking simile when dealing with the question of imposing a limit on the number of tenants reinstated. His image was that of a concert-hall, and on the harmony of that concert-hall I will not dwell. But does not the noble Earl's argument show how impossible it would be for him, without any limit at all, to close the door of his concert-hall against the number of applicants who will be thundering at it for admission?

I may be asked why, holding these views, I do not move that the Bill be read a second time this day three months. I will give to your Lordships, in half a dozen words, my reasons for preferring the course which I venture to recommend to the House, namely, that we should read it a second time and then endeavour to amend some of its most objectionable provisions in Committee. In the first place, we are pledged to a measure of reinstatement of some kind, and if your Lordships were to throw out this Bill on Second Reading it would certainly be said that you had receded, I will not say from a bargain, but from a kind of understanding which was arrived at in 1903. In the next place, this Bill comes here supported by enormous majorities in the other House of Parliament, and I believe your Lordships will always desire to treat attentively and respectfully Bills that come to you with such a recommendation.

But there is a third reason, and to my mind the strongest of all. I cannot help fearing that the summary rejection of this Bill might greatly increase the difficulties of the executive Government in Ireland. We know what those difficulties are. It does not matter for the purpose of my argument whether, as I believe it to be the case, some of those difficulties are largely due to the unwise administration of His Majesty's Ministers; they exist. It is impossible to read the language of learned Judges without a feeling of profound anxiety; besides which we know that, for the first time, I believe, that magnificent force, the Royal Irish Constabulary, has been touched with disaffection. In those circumstances, and when this Bill is represented to us by the responsible Ministers as one urgently needed for the sake of peace in Ireland, I am not prepared to take the responsibility of moving its rejection on Second Reading. I can imagine the kind of use which would be made of our rejection of such a Bill, and—I speak frankly—I do not wish to put that weapon in the hands of those who are instrumental in promoting agitation in Ireland or of those who support them in this country. In my belief it should be possible to amend the Bill in such a manner as to modify some of its most dangerous provisions without depriving those who are entitled to relief of one jot or tittle of what is due to them, and I think we have a right in resorting to that mode of procedure to appeal to His Majesty's Government for their support in so amending this Bill that, while it will bring relief where it is most needed, it will not leave behind it, as in its present condition it certainly would, a sense of rankling wrong and injustice.

LORD ATKINSON: My Lords, I should not have thought for a moment of intruding myself upon your Lordships' attention by intervening in this debate but for three reasons. In the first place, it has been my good or evil fortune through a long official career in Ireland, to have taken part in shaping the agrarian legislation that has been passed for that country from 1889 to 1905, and I do not like the last and fairest member of this legislative progeny to be mutilated before my eyes in silence. My second reason is this: I have never been what in Ireland is called a "landlords' man"; nor, although I had the honour of representing for ten years an agricultural constituency in Ireland, have I ever been what is called a "tenants' man"; but I am, my Lords, and have always been, the open advocate of justice to both of these classes—and it is because many of the provisions of this Bill, in my view, offend egregiously against that principle that I wish to criticise its details. There is a third reason, and it is this, that some of these provisions appear, to my mind, to offend against a principle which I have always understood was sacred—a principle which has elevated our judicial proceedings and our Executive administration—namely, that a man should not be judge in his own case.

I do not think that any friend of the evicted tenants can accuse the late Government of being their enemies. We brought in, in 1891, the first legislative provision that was ever introduced for the reinstatement of evicted tenants. Under that Act, notwithstanding that they had forfeited their position, they were entitled to be reinstated by purchase. In 1896 we went further still, and provided, under the Act of that year, that they might be reinstated not only by purchase but as present tenants, with all the advantages of present tenants and by the mediation of the Land Commission;

and in the last Act—the Act of 1903—by voluntary methods and as incident to the great purpose of that Bill—namely, the conversion of the occupying tenantry of Ireland into owners—this question was, if possible, to be settled. There was not a single Nationalist member in the House of Commons upon the occasion of the discussion of this clause who did not again and again repeat that it should be carried out by voluntary methods, as all the other clauses were to be carried out; and Mr. Wyndham, who had then the carriage of that Bill, again and again, with universal consent, asserted that there was no desire to give priority to evicted tenants over any of the classes dealt with in Section 3—namely, the people in small holdings and the people in congested districts. Evicted tenants were to be treated with equal justice, and there was to be no effort to thrust the question of the evicted tenants into the front and make it the primary and main purpose of this great remedial measure.

I have heard the rules and regulations, the administrative guides to the carrying out of the principles and policy of the measure of 1903 characterised more than once. I personally am responsible in some degree for their shape, and I do not shrink from defending them. I knew they were legal; I thought they were wise; I believed them to be just. I am convinced of that now. What was our policy? We laid down that the question of the reinstatement of the evicted tenants should be taken up when the estate from which he had been evicted came on for sale, not that if it never came on for purchase he should never be restored. Quite the contrary. The passage which the noble Earl alluded to contains no such provision. The main lines on which the policy was to run was that the question of reinstatement should be brought up when the estate from which he was evicted came up for sale. The reason for that was obvious. Had that policy been carried out, when the tenant was reinstated he would have gone back to his own home, amongst his own friends. He would have been exactly in a position of equality with them, and would neither have been an object of envy to the other tenants nor have been placed in a position where his success would be an example to be followed. That was the main purchase of our measure.

But that policy was not good enough for the Estates Commissioners, and they accordingly applied—they rather boast of it—for the creation of an independent Department for the investigation of these cases. That independent Department was refused by the late Government, and refused upon the ground solely that it was desired to do nothing in this question of reinstatement which would induce any man not to pay his rent. The rule laid down was adhered to; but scarcely had the present Government got into office than a change was made. It was an unfortunate change. I think it has had unfortunate results, because it must be remembered that in 1893, when the Mathew Commission sat, the number of evicted tenants on the Plan of Campaign estates, as they were called—that is, those estates in which a criminal conspiracy not to pay rent had been rampant—was only 880. The claims sent in from Ireland in addition numbered 2,500, so that the evicted tenants who in 1893 claimed to be reinstated numbered, roughly, 3,500. Anybody who knows Ireland knows that there was no considerable eviction of tenants between 1893 and 1904; yet it has been found that nearly 5,000 additional men have sent in claims. In the last year that the late Government were in office the claims had gone down to 660, and even the number to which they then reached was a matter of astonishment. The Nationalist Members, who have behaved nobly in this matter of the evicted tenants, for they have never deserted them, must have known their real numbers, and the highest estimate put by Mr. Davitt was 1,000, while Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Redmond put the number at 800. The sum named by Mr. Morley when Chief Secretary for Ireland to settle the evicted tenants question was £250,000, but the Estates Commissioners now ask £2,500,000.

What was the next result of that new departure? It was that in twelve months 3,111 additional claims were sent in. Why? Because you raised false hopes and extravagant expectations. Although these claims have been investigated, and although you have reinstated over 1,000, two thousand more are to be reinstated. The noble Lord who so efficiently represents the Irish Office in your Lordships' House, Lord Denman, told us the other night that the Government were afraid to give the names of the men who had been selected because the disappointed ones might resort to crime. That is a triumph of administration! What a tremendous proof of the confidence that is to be reposed in these Estates Commissioners, whom it is again and again suggested it is almost an iniquity to doubt! What do you propose to do? You propose a system which I bitterly regret to say—and I ought to know Ireland—will manufacture evicted tenants faster than you will reinstate them.

If this Bill were to pass into law a case such as this is quite possible. Take a landlord with fifty tenants. Two of them he has evicted; they are out, and their holdings are vacant; but forty-eight remain. He tries to sell. He and his tenants cannot agree. Down come the Estates Commissioners—those engines of destruction—and put back the two evicted tenants on to their farms, in the midst of the forty-eight others, with £150 or £200 in their pockets and a rent fixed in their case twenty or thirty per cent. less than their neighbours were paying. I would be the last to attribute to any of my countrymen a double dose of original sin, but it is crediting them with almost angelic virtues to think for a moment that they will be able to resist the temptation to follow a course that they have seen has been so lucrative and successful. I do not know how the Government intend to deal with the 5,000 disappointed tenants. I can well understand that there is a great reluctance to limit the number in this Bill; but I shall be amazed, if the Bill is passed and the numbers are left unfixed, if the 5,000 disappointed ones will not bring pressure sufficient to make you open the door again and reinstate them, although for the moment their claims have been declared to be unfounded.

I have searched through this Bill to endeavour to find some broad and general principle on which it is based, and the only principle I can find is this, that all human virtues are supposed to be concentrated in a man the moment he refuses to pay his rent, and that all human vices are supposed to be concentrated in a man who asks him to pay or seeks to make him pay his rent; that the interests of the sinner are to be sacrificed to the interests of the saint on every possible occasion, the Estates Commissioners acting as high priests at the ceremony. Landlords are to be sacrificed, planters are to be sacrificed, purchasing tenants are to be sacrificed, and tenants who have agreed to purchase, and whose agreements to the amount of £30,000,000 are hung up for want of money, are to be sacrificed. As Lord Dunraven pointed out so forcibly the other day, this is a state of things which brings loss upon the tenant, inasmuch as he has to pay a quarter per cent. more than he would pay if his purchase were completed, and it adds to the term of the interregnum during which that money has to be paid. I do not think this Bill will be popular when it is known that £3,000.000 are taken from the fund which should go to finance these contracts to reinstate evicted tenants.

My noble friend Lord Lansdowne has dealt with the question of compulsion. I quite agree that both Parties have pledged themselves as far as possible to reinstate the evicted tenants, and if compulsion be necessary for that I do not think this Bill should be rejected because it embodies the principle of compulsion. But let it be honest and just compulsion. I have endeavoured to acquaint myself with the legislation upon this question of compulsory purchase, not only in this country but in the Colonies and in India, and I say this with confidence, that nowhere where the British flag flies was there ever a compulsory measure of this character produced. Generally speaking, the characteristics of all legislation by which a man's property is taken from him compulsorily are, first, that the object should be a great public object; secondly, that it should be necessary to take the land; thirdly, that the purchase should be sanctioned by some authority outside and different from the persons who are the purchasers; and fourthly—and this is a matter of vital importance—that compensation should be given to the person who is deprived of his property for the loss he sustains by that purchase, which is an entirely different matter from the price the article taken.

I will take the liberty of calling your Lordships' attention to the very first words of this Bill, which are certainly the most extraordinary that ever found their way into any compulsory measure. The words are—

> "If the Estate Commissioners deem it expedient."

We happen to know their opinions, for they have given them with some ostentation and at length in their evidence before the Dudley Commission. I might for a moment contrast the language of this Bill with the language of a kindred measure—the Allotments Act—in this country. The words of that Act are—

> "If a parish council or district council are unable to hire or purchase land by voluntary means"

they may put compulsory powers into action. "If they are unable." There is nothing of that kind in this Bill. This Bill merely provides that "if the Estates Commissioners deem it expedient" they may roam all over Ireland and take land compulsorily when they please, where they please, in any quantity they please, and at what price they please. If the Bill passes in its present form it would have been simpler to have introduced a Bill in the following terms:—

> "Whereas the Estates Commissioners are possessed of all knowledge and are deserving of all confidence, be it enacted that for the purpose of reinstating evicted tenants in Ireland they may take any land they like, at any place they like, at any time they like, in any quantity they like, and pay for it what they like."

For that is really what this Bill does. I should like to contrast the provisions of this Bill with the provisions of kindred measures in this country. Let me take, first, the Education Department. Surely the Government will not assert that the School Boards were not worthy of all confidence, and surely they will not say that the education of the children of England was not an object as much deserving of the care of the Government as the reinstatement of the evicted tenants. Yet they did not give the school boards power to acquire any land they liked in any place they liked. On the contrary, school boards were required to present a petition to the Education Department; the Department were then required to direct an inquiry; they then had to make an Order which was to be affirmed by Parliament, and the Lands Clauses Act, 1845, was to be incorporated.

Lord Atkinson.

I come to the question of the housing of the working classes. Surely one would suppose that the persons who rot and pine in want and misery in the slums of London or in the great towns of England were as worthy objects for the beneficent action of the Government as the evicted tenants, and surely one would suppose that the municipalities of England were as worthy of confidence as the Estates Commissioners. But did the Government give them absolute authority to go where they pleased and to take what land they pleased? No. The local authority must prepare a scheme; the scheme must go before the Local Government Board; a Secretary of State in London or Parliament, must investigate the matter; compensation must be awarded by an independent arbitrator, and if the amount exceeds £1,000 it is to be tried before a Judge and jury.

I ask, what special grace has fallen upon the Estates Commissioners? What special merit do these men who have not paid rent possess beyond that of the poor in our slums and the children in our schools? I challenge the noble Earl or any noble Lord on the opposite side of the House to point to any one instance where, in all the wide expanse of this great Empire, power has been given similar to that which is proposed to be exercised under the provisions of this Bill. Take, again, the question of allotments in England. The local authorities cannot take land compulsorily for this purpose without securing the sanction, after inquiry, of a Government Department. And if you go to Ireland you find that for all purposes of public health and for the Labourers Act the power given does not in the faintest degree correspond to the large power which it is proposed to give under this Bill to the Estates Commissioners. Therefore I say that to give the Commissioners these powers is without parallel, and is, I submit, most unjust. Even under the Defence Acts and the Military Lands Acts, the Secretary of State for War cannot, except in the case of actual invasion of this country, take land except with the consent of the lord-lieutenant of the county, or by Provisional Order.

It is not necessary at this stage to indicate what should be the method provided for an appeal; but for myself I think there is no difficulty whatever in providing a competent and satisfactory tribunal of appeal. Under Mr. Gladstone's Land Act of 1870 a Judge of Assize was the tribunal to fix the compensation to be paid to a tenant who was evicted, and also to fix the amount to be paid for an unexhausted improvement. There would, therefore, be nothing unprecedented in making the Court of a Judge of Assize the tribunal of appeal from the Estates Commissioners. An appeal has been made to us to have confidence in the Commisssioners. Whether it is their misfortune or their fault, the Commissioners have not got the confidence of the landlord party in Ireland; and I do not think they will have the confidence of the 5,000 disappointed claimants, nor of the planters whom it is intended to turn out, nor, indeed, of those tenants who have purchased their holdings and would be comfortably living on their land as proprietors if the Commissioners had completed the contracts.

And I do not think the evidence of Mr. Finucane is likely to inspire confidence. I think it ought to be read at every landlords' club and at every village inn. It is not generally known that he proposes that he should go all over Ireland and that, for the purpose of obtaining land for the relief of congestion, whenever he finds a man with a farm valued at more than £100 he should take half of it away from him. I do not wish to make any accusation against the probity of the Estates Commissioners or any suggestion as to their anxiety not to do what is right. But I say that they have views upon this question of the value of land which must deprive them of the confidence of those who have interests in land. Mr. Commissioner Bailey, who was for fifteen years a sub-Commissioner, gave evidence as to the mode in which the rents were fixed. I believe that frequently in this House, often in the other House of Parliament I know, statements were made that the settlement of rents went on upon no fixed or rational principle; but Mr. Bailey is the first official to make that confession openly and apparently unabashed. Mr. Bailey acknowledges that there was no principle ever laid down in fixing rents. I forgot to refer to the happy position of the evicted tenant when reinstated. He is to pay nobody. His property is not to be made available for the payment of debts. This reminds me of an amusing Irish romance in which words are put into the mouth of an Irish chieftain that he had—

> "no idea of frittering away his property in paying his debts,"

but this is the first time I ever saw that precedent embodied in a Bill.

What is the next thing that Mr. Finucane lays down? It is that in estimating the price to be paid for land the Commissioners are not to take into account what the owner is making out of it. If property is taken under the Lands Clauses Act, or any kindred Act, the first question asked in estimating the value is, how much is the owner making out of it, and how much will he lose by being deprived of it; and compensation on that basis would be given by any just arbitrator. But not so according to Mr. Bailey and Mr. Finucane. Although men are letting grazing lands to graziers and getting £2 an acre, they are not to be compensated at that rate. A distinguished friend of mine, long a Member of the other House, put to Mr. Bailey this question, Supposing a man for the last fifteen years has been getting £2 an acre for his grazing land, why should you not pay him that price? Sir Antony MacDonnell came to the rescue and said that grazing was, after all, precarious; and Mr. Finucane added that the law with regard to the importation of Canadian cattle might be removed at any time, and that then the price of grass land would go down to nothing. I have not the advantage of possessing grazing land, but if I had and was letting it at £2 an acre I must say I would not have much confidence in a gentleman who entertained those opinions. That view is concurred in by Commissioner Bailey, and the mystery to me is how it comes that grazing rents that have been paid for the last fifteen years are considered unsuitable to be taken as the basis on which to calculate the value of the land.

I do not wish to trespass unduly upon your Lordships' time, but there is one other matter which, to my mind, is extremely grave. It is complained that some landlords have desired to cut up their grazing lands and to sell to tenants under the Purchase Act; but, according to the Estates Commissioners, that would not do, as it "would not carry out the principle of the Act." Sir Antony MacDonnell says—

> "Parliament in its wisdom has enacted a measure which is for the good of the whole community, and that measure lays down the rule that a landlord disposing of his property shall only do so in accordance with the spirit of that measure."

The Commissioners' ground for refusing to declare such land an estate is that it is not fit to be so declared for the purposes of the Act. Power is given to the Commissioners to declare land as an estate—that is for two purposes, mainly for the purpose of securing the bonus, and secondly, for applying the zone; and I submit that that is a discretion which ought to be exercised by them in a judicial spirit. Where a landlord proposes to sell grazing land to a tenant, and the Commissioners refuse to define that as an estate in order to put pressure upon the landlord to sell the land to them—I say that a greater abuse of judicial discretion could not well be conceived. If a landlord is selling land to a tenant within the Act and the transaction is fair and square, they have no right to say they will not define it as an estate in order that they may themselves acquire it for some other project they may have in view. No doubt they are enthusiasts. I do not mean for a moment to impute anything intentionally wrong to them; I only impute to them erroneous notions as to their powers and false tests as to value. I think the provision in the Bill with regard to the bonus rather mean. The bonus fund was created for the purpose of inducing landlords who could not afford to sell without it to bring their estates into the market; and while it is true that the present landlords will not be deprived of it by the provisions in this Bill, it is certain that landlords will who may sell after this period.

I wish to say a word as to the position of the Commissioners. If there was one thing more than another insisted upon by the Nationalist Members, and by the Government at the time the Act was passing, it was that these were to be administrative offices. For that reason it was provided, in Section 23 of the Act, that the Commissioners should be under the control of the Lord-Lieutenant, and obliged to carry out their duties in conformity with general regulations made for them. You now seek to make them Judges. Do you take them from under the control of the Lord-Lieutenant? A Judge, if he is to be a Judge, ought to be independent of all control by the Executive. And if that control is to be removed, and they are to be in the position of Judges, who ever heard of Judges having administrative duties, and paying away millions of money without the Treasury or any other body being able to control them, or to remove them from their office, if their management was not wise and right? Therefore I insist that there is no case whatever made out for the proposed change in the position of the Commissioners.

I object to this Bill, not because it embodies the principle of compulsion, but because it sets up machinery for carrying out a wrong and vicious proposal and one which is absolutely without parallel. I confess, my Lords, that I was one of those who looked to the Act of 1903 with high hopes. I had hope that that Act would prove a message of peace—it was said to be a Divine message, and to have healing in its wings—and that it would put an end to the bitter strife that has for generations poisoned the social life of Ireland and blighted the energies of her people. But by the proposals embodied in this Bill the fair promise has been blighted, and instead of peaceful, harmonious co-operation in the carrying-out of a great agrarian revolution for the benefit of all concerned, this measure will be the forerunner of others in whose wake will arise greater evils, with discontent and friction, where there might have been happiness and progress.

*The Earl of DUNRAVEN: My Lords, in spite of what was said by the noble Earl opposite at the close of his speech I confess that I find it somewhat difficult to consider this measure purely on its own merits and entirely within its own limits, owing to the fact that coming events of a much larger character cast their shadow through and beyond this measure. I think we may take it as absolutely certain that before very long Parliament will be called upon to deal with a very much larger question—namely, the uneconomic condition of large tracts of country in the West; and I think we may take it as morally certain that that measure, whatever its special provisions may be, will be at any rate based on the principles that obtain in this Bill—the compulsory acquisition of land. I do not intend to go into that subject, at any rate, not to the extent to which it was dealt with by the noble and learned Lord who has just spoken, and who, in his eloquent and instructive speech, criticised very fully the evidence given before a Royal Commission inquiring into a totally different subject and which has not yet reported. But, at the same time, in view of the fact that another and larger measure dealing with land in Ireland is absolutely certain to come before Parliament ere long, I think this measure, which certainly contains principles which will be found embodied in the larger Bill, deserves careful scrutiny and a consideration from your Lordships which, under ordinary circumstances, might possibly be thought hypercritical.

This Bill is founded on two propositions—that the reinstatement of evicted tenants is an urgent question and should be promptly dealt with, and that for that purpose compulsory powers are necessary. With both of these propositions I agree, and I may be excused for holding fast to the terms in the Report of the Land Conference. We reported that any measure dealing with land purchase in Ireland should be accompanied by a measure for the restoration of evicted tenants. I think the very words themselves show that it was not in our minds at any rate that the operation of restoration should be confined to estates as they were sold. The two questions are not identical—they are closely allied, but they are not identical; and the very expression we used, that any project for land purchase should be "accompanied" by a measure for the restoration of evicted tenants, precludes the argument that we could possibly have had it in our minds that restoration was only to take place as estates were sold I think Parliament took the same view

I am sure that all your Lordships who know Ireland will admit that the fact that this evicted tenant question has not been dealt with stands in the way of a clean settlement of the whole land question—it stands in the way of peace and contentment, it causes delay, it causes friction, and in the interest of peace the causes of delay and friction ought to be removed. Delay tells very hardly on the evicted tenants. The case of an evicted tenant desiring restoration in order to purchase is a very different one from that of the ordinary tenant who has not been evicted and who desires to purchase. I quite admit that in the latter case it is a great hardship upon the tenant that, owing to lack of money and to delay, due, perhaps, to other causes, he is unable to get the land vested in him; but, while he is waiting, he at any rate reaps some advantages under the Act of 1903. He ceases to be a tenant and to pay rent, and pays a fixed interest instead, and he is relieved of all the uncertainty which is incidental to the position of a tenant. So that he reaps some considerable benefit. But how about the evicted tenant who wants to be reinstated in order to purchase? His condition is a pitiable, and, in many cases, a most deplorable one. He cannot afford to wait. Delay affects him disastrously. There is no sense in telling a man who is starving that he may get a meal in a week or a month's time; and if an evicted tenant is desirous of being reinstated in his holding or in some other holding for the purpose of purchasing, and you admit that his claim is a just one and that he ought to be reinstated, it surely is very small comfort to him to say that his claim may possibly be attended to in fifteen or twenty years time. The case is urgent and ought to be dealt with; and I think the first proposition on which the Bill is founded, that the reinstatement of evicted tenants is an urgent question deserving prompt and efficient treatment, is amply proved.

Now, as to compulsion, I admit that I can see no case for compulsion if it is to be based upon the assumption that reinstatement has not been effected by voluntary means, or that landlords have proved obstructive and have as a class shown unwillingness to reinstate evicted tenants. The Report of the Estates Commissioners proves conclusively that landlords have not been obstructive but have been perfectly willing to restore evicted tenants. On fifteen out of seventeen of the Plan of Campaign estates the evicted tenants have been reinstated voluntarily. Altogether, I think, 1,033 reinstatements have taken place voluntarily, and it is absolutely impossible to say that compulsion is necessary because landlords as a class have proved unwilling voluntarily to reinstate these tenants. It may seem an absolutely ridiculous paradox, but really, in a sense, it is true, that in proportion as voluntary methods have been successful their very success proves the necessity for compulsion. Is it right that the action of one or two unreasonable men, or one or two men putting forward perfectly unreasonable objections to reinstatements—is it right that their action should stultify, if not entirely nullify, all the good resulting from the action of the great majority, who have been perfectly ready voluntarily to reinstate evicted tenants? I say it is not right, and the very fact that reinstatements have voluntarily taken place to this large extent, but are stopped in very few cases where they will not be permitted under any circumstances or on any terms, shows that it is wise and necessary and justifiable to resort in those cases to compulsion.

I am bound to say that some of the objections mentioned in the Special Report of the Estates Commissioners as raised by landlords seem to me not to be valid objections; others appear to me to be perfectly valid. I should have hoped that for the sake of peace, in the case of a great measure of appeasement such as the Act of 1903 to a large extent is, matters of mere personal feeling would be dismissed. They do not seem to me to be valid objections; but, on the other hand, there is surely a great deal to be said for the landowner who has lost heavily in arrears on an evicted farm and has then laid out large sums of money upon it and now farms it as part of his own farm or domain. I have always thought, and think still, that if the Estates Commissioners had had power to make a composition of arrears and to offer, say, one year as composition for all arrears as a free gift, it would have been most stimulating in the reinstatement of evicted tenants. I agree, therefore, to the main principle of the Bill, that the reinstatement should take place quickly; and that for that purpose compulsion is necessary. I daresay the provisions of this Bill as regards the exercise of compulsory powers are quite extraordinary. I have no doubt the noble and learned Lord who spoke last is perfectly justified in all he said, in all the comparisons he drew with the provisions concerning compulsory powers in other Acts. I do not wish to follow him into that, except to say that in my humble opinion the schemes prepared by district councils and county councils, and the provisions affecting, say, the Allotment Act in Great Britain, would not be at all commodious or wise if applied to the exercise of compulsory powers in Ireland. But I submit that if the procedure is peculiar, the whole circumstances in this case are peculiar. There is nothing like it that I know of in any other part of the British Empire. Parliament wisely agrees to find a sum of £112,000,000 or £120,000,000—I forget which—for the settlement of the land question of Ireland, for a great act of appeasement; and Parliament wisely says at the same time that, in order to insure that it shall be a great act of appeasement, the evicted tenants have to be restored. Promptness is the very essence of the matter. I do not think you will find anything on all-fours with this, or anything sufficiently closely analogous to it to justify argument as to what procedure should be used in this Bill from the procedure which is used in regard to other Acts dealing with compulsory powers under totally different circumstances.

But, my Lords, I do not mean to say that I am at all satisfied, myself, with the methods employed in this Bill. The powers granted to the Estates Commissioners are enormous, and so are the duties cast upon them; they have got to buy the land and settle for themselves what price they are going to pay for it: and not only that, but they have got afterwards to sell the land and to settle what price they will sell it at; and, contrary to all the ordinary dictates of commerce, they are not to endeavour to buy cheap and sell dear, but they have got to buy dear and sell cheap; and they will have the microscopic eye of the Treasury scrutinising their every action in that respect. There is no limit whatever placed upon their actions—no limit of time, no limit of acreage, no limit of money, no limit of any kind. I have, personally, great confidence in the Estates Commissioners—I think that by this time they know probably more about the value of land than any other three gentlemen in Ireland; and I should have confidence in them in all these matters if only the Bill stated explicitly the lines on which they were to act and said explicitly what they were to do and what they were not to do. But I think it is rather a strong order to give to any three men—I do not care who they are—the powers that are conferred on the Estates Commissioners by this Bill, without at the same time giving them specific indications of how those powers are to be used. I, myself, am not satisfied with the definition in the Bill of what is a fair price to be given to the expropriated landlord. The words in the Bill are "the fair market value thereof."

LORD ASHBOURNE: It is a bad word.

*THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: I think it is a bad word, because I am not sure, but I think generally it would be considered to mean the fair market value that land of that character and kind fetched in the market. I may be wrong, but my impression is that grazing land, which is the land that probably would be taken up, very seldom changes hands in market; it is not currently bought and sold; and the value of the land ought to be not its selling value, but the rental that is received out of it. Now I must prefer the formula which I think was used by Mr. Finucane in the evidence which he gave before Lord Dudley's Commission. I admit I have not looked at the proceedings of the Commission, and from what fell from the noble Lord, Lord Atkinson, it seems to me almost improbable that Mr. Finucane used those words, but the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant quoted Mr. Finucane as having laid down a formula and approved of it, and that formula was that Mr. Finucane thought that a fair price would be such a price as would yield the vendor the normal income he had received from the land for the last five or ten years. Now that seems to me perfectly fair, and infinitely better than the words that are contained in the Bill. This is a matter that ought to be very carefully defined in the Bill, because as I have said, the Commissioners have got to buy the land, and then they have got to sell it for a totally different purpose. It is no use blinking facts, and the fact of this matter is that for certain purposes—the purposes of this Bill, which to my mind are very wise and beneficent purposes—you are taking the land compulsorily and turning it from a more profitable to a less profitable use. That is an absolute fact. You take, we will say, 100 acres of first-class grazing land, which I will suppose is let for £3 an acre, or something of that kind; you cut it up into four farms to be devoted to tillage, which may be worth I do not know what—probably 15s. or £1 an acre—but there must be a big loss on the transaction, and it is quite possible that the Estates Commissioners, perfectly naturally and honestly and properly, may say to themselves, "We have got to use this land, when we have got it, for certain purposes, and the fair price for it is its fair market value when devoted to that use. That is what we have got to sell it for, and therefore we ought not to give more than its fair market value when it is turned into tillage." That would not be a fair price, and I hope it will be clearly specified in the Bill that the fair price should be based upon the normal rent received for the land when it is grazing land over, as Mr. Finucane suggested, say, the last five or ten years.

I think some limitation, whether of money, or of area, or of time, is absolutely necessary, and I think the more your Lordships look into this Bill, the more you will find that the necessity for some limitation arises. And I would ask your Lordships to remember that Clause 11 states that—

> "Any land acquired under this Act which is not required for the purposes of this Act may be

sold under the Land Purchase Acts to any person mentioned in Section 2 of the Act of 1903."

That is to say, that if the Estates Commissioners become possessed compulsorily of more land than they require for reinstating evicted tenants, they can use it for the ordinary purposes of the Land Purchase Act of 1903. I do not think that the Estates Commissioners will make an improper use of that clause, but I would point out to your Lordships that it undoubtedly enables the Estates Commissioners, if they choose, under instructions from the Government, or without any instructions, practically to convert the 1903 Act from a voluntary Act to a compulsory Act. Another clause of this Bill gives the Estates Commissioners the whole of the unexpended portion of the bonus to draw upon in case they make a loss over the purchase and sale of land. I suppose of the bonus there must be at least some £8,000,000 unexpended, and you give the Estates Commissioners absolute power to draw on nearly £8,000,000 of money in this matter, and they are not limited, therefore, on account of expense. And it is possible—I do not say that it is probable, but it is perfectly possible—that under those circumstances the Estates Commissioners, up to that limit of £8,000,000 loss in the transaction, can buy any quantity of land in Ireland, and then say, "We do not require all this for the evicted tenants; we will turn it over to the ordinary purposes of the Act, and so convert the Act into practically a compulsory Act."

Neither do I like the powers of the Estates Commissioners over what are commonly called the planters. I do not think it can be denied that it was perfectly understood by all parties and on all sides in Parliament during the discussions on the Bill of 1903 that a planter who had become a *bona fide*, real, occupying tenant should not be dispossessed—that no pressure, direct or indirect, was to be placed upon him. It is ridiculous to say that no pressure has been exercised upon a man in those circumstances if the Estates Commissioners are to approach him armed with compulsory powers. I do not think that there is any real disagreement on that point. I think it will be agreed and accepted on both sides of the House that if a new tenant—a planter—has really acquired a substantial interest in a holding, is a *bona fide* tenant, and is rooted in the soil, he ought not to be, and is not to be, dispossessed. I do not think there is any difference of opinion about that, but there should be something in the Bill to show that that is the intention, and there is not a word to that effect in the Bill at present. It may be said that it is quite safe to leave that matter to the discretion of the Estates Commissioners. Possibly it is, but at the same time I should be much more satisfied if there was something in the nature of an instruction inserted to the effect that where a new tenant has, as I say, obtained a real, substantial interest in a holding, has held it for a long time, has improved it, and so on, and is acclimatised and rooted in the soil, he should not be absolutely turned out.

I wish to enter a very strong protest against placing the loss that may be incurred by the Estates Commissioners between buying and selling upon the grant-in-aid. I would suggest that it is, to say the least of it, a very unusual thing to insert in a Bill a provision which will practically amend, in one of its most important particulars, a former Act of Parliament. The object of the grant-in-aid is perfectly well known to your Lordships. I must be excused for constantly alluding to the Land Conference, but still, the Land Conference recognised that between the price which the landlord could be expected to take and the price which the tenant could be expected to give, a certain gap must exist. The Land Conference recommended that that gap should be bridged over, and Parliament did bridge it over to the extent of £12,000,000. And the absolute words in the Act are that the grant-in-aid is "for the purpose of aiding the sales of estates under this Act"—that is the Act of 1903. What the present Bill proposes to do is to apply the bonus to a totally different purpose and object under a totally different Act. That seems to be at any rate a most unusual proceeding. Of course it may be argued that applying it to this purpose does aid, or will aid, the sale of estates. That would be a very disingenuous argument, I think, and it might be equally well said that the bonus, if applied to the Department of Agriculture, or to the enlargement of small or uneconomic holdings would also aid in the sale of estates. So it would in a sense, but not in the sense in which it was intended. The Act of 1903 provides that the Treasury has power at quinquennial periods to revise the percentage, and the reason is given perfectly plainly. The Treasury can revise the percentage for the purpose of adjusting the relations between the unexpended portions of the fund and the claims that may be made upon it. That is to say, that if the Treasury found that the claims were not so large as they expected, they could increase the interest beyond the 12 per cent.; if, on the other hand, they found that the claims were greater, and that the £12,000,000 would not go round, they could decrease the interest. The operations of the Act of 1903 are confined to the definite purpose of bridging over the gap between the price the landlord ought to take and the price the tenant ought to give, and I protest strongly against the diversion of the bonus to any other purpose than that.

I object to it, too, because it interferes seriously with the Land Conference Report. I look upon the Report of the Land Conference as a treaty of peace, and I protest against that treaty being denounced. If this bonus is to be applied in this manner, it certainly will be a complete stultification of the Land Conference Report; and I entreat His Majesty's Government—I do not know whether it can be done in this House, but I entreat His Majesty's Government, if it be possible, not to do anything in this Bill which can possibly invalidate the treaty which was arrived at in the Land Conference. It was owing to that Land Conference that the great and beneficent Act of 1903 became possible; and in my humble opinion the education question and many other problems in Ireland can only be solved, or at any rate have their best chance of being solved, by agreements entered into in conferences of a similar character and animated by a similar spirit. I look with positive dismay at any legislation that can possibly lessen, in the eyes of the people of Ireland, the importance to be attached to the Land Conference and to the Act that followed upon it. It is perfectly true that the amount required may not be very large, and my noble friend the Earl of Crewe said the amount should not be more than £100,000. If that is true, I would venture to say that the unexpended balance of the reserve fund is quite ample to find a sum sufficient to pay the interest on £100,000, if the loss made by the Estates Commissioners is not to be larger than that. But I would point out to your Lordships the necessity in this case also of a limit to the operations of the Estates Commissioners. As it is, with their operations absolutely unlimited, it is possible for them to draw upon and expend the whole of the grant-in-aid—the whole of it that is not already expended. If they are properly limited, as I suppose it is assumed they will be limited, in this Bill, then it is quite possible the loan may be a very small one, not more than £100,000. Still, in that case, I enter my protest, upon the principle of the thing, against the grant-in-aid being diverted, on any pretext whatever, from its original purpose as set out in the Act of 1903.

My Lords, I would respectfully ask His Majesty's Government for information on one or two points. I should like to know what land can be taken—I mean to say land subject to what conditions of tenure? Clause 1 of the Bill is very comprehensive; it says that the Estates Commissioners can compulsorily take up any land. Then the Bill goes on to specify the exemptions—the land which cannot be taken up. In the same clause, Subclause (3), it says that no tenanted land is to be acquired compulsorily, unless it is in the occupation of a new tenant; and Clause 6, I think it is, exempts untenanted land which forms part of the demesne, home-farm, garden, and so on. Therefore, the exemptions are: untenanted land that forms part of a demesne, and so on, and tenanted land which is in the hands of planters. Over all other land the Estates Commissioners have absolute powers. Does not that include all holdings, freeholds, that have been purchased under the 1903 Act or other Land Purchase Acts? These holdings are not tenanted land. The proprietors are not tenants. They are not exempt on that account. I do not know whether there is any special legal meaning to be attached to the expression "tenanted land." I imagine not, because, according to the Bill it seems to have merely the ordinary meaning. In Clause 1, Subclause (4) it says—

> "For the purposes of this enactment a person shall be deemed to be a tenant notwithstanding that he may have agreed to purchase his holding, if the agreement was entered into after the 1st day of January, 1907, and if the holding has not become vested in him as a purchaser under the Land Purchase Acts."

A person is a tenant if the holding has not become vested in him; and, I suppose, he is not a tenant if the holding has become vested in him; and if he is not a tenant, his land is not tenanted land.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: A tenant purchaser possibly might be turned out unless there is some saving language.

*THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: A tenant purchaser can be turned out to-morrow by the Estates Commissioners. I cannot imagine for a single moment that that is the intention of His Majesty's Government; but I am perfectly certain that if by this Bill, or by any other Bill, it is impressed upon the minds of tenant purchasers in Ireland that there is any possible doubt of the validity of their title, that they are not absolutely secure in their holdings, and in the enjoyment of the fruits of their holdings and of their labour and industry, and the expenditure of their money—if the smallest inkling of doubt arises, you may say good-bye to any possible improvement in agriculture and in the prosperity of Ireland. The men will feel themselves, and naturally, to be in a less secure position than if they were tenants. If they were tenants at any rate they could have the rent fixed, and could be secure for fifteen years. Now as this Bill stands, it is possible for the Estates Commissioners to go to any man who has bought, say, 200 acres of land and to say to him, "Here, we want your 200 acres of land; our price is so and so, you must go out at once." I am sure that cannot be the intention of His Majesty's Government, and I trust they will see that it is not rendered possible in this Bill that the property of a freeholder, a man who has bought under any of the Land Purchase Acts, can be compulsorily taken from him.

My Lords, I must also admit, although I dare say I am very stupid, that I cannot clearly understand what will be the financial condition of the expropriated owners. The Estates Commissioners buy the land, and I suppose more or less under the conditions of, I think it is, the 6th clause of the Act of 1903. In a case where estates are sold to the Estates Commissioners, is the expropriated landlord to receive interest at 3½ per cent., and, if so, from what date? The Estates Commissioners cannot vest the land in themselves until the purchase money is lodged in the Bank of Ireland, and it may not be convenient for the Treasury to find the money, and there may be considerable time between the date when the owner ceases to derive any money from the land and the date when the purchase money is deposited in the bank and the land becomes vested in the Estates Commissioners. What I want to know is, are the expropriated landlords entitled to receive interest at 2½ per cent. from the moment when they cease to derive any benefit from the land?

LORD ASHBOURNE: And from whom?

*THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: And from whom? I take it from the Estates Commissioners. If the Estates Commissioners have to borrow the money from the Public Debt Commissioners they will probably have to pay them interest; and the Estates Commissioners may find themselves in the position of paying the Public Debt Commissioners 2¾ per cent. interest, and the expropriated landlord 3½ per cent. interest; that is 6¼ per cent. altogether. If that is right, I want it made clear. I have no earthly objection to the Estates Commissioners paying it; the only thing I am anxious about is to know first of all, that the expropriated owner gets his interest from the date when he ceases to receive rent; and secondly, whether the Estates Commissioners are responsible to him for arrears. He may have a considerable sum for arrears due for rent, and he cannot possibly collect it himself; there would be no legal process in Ireland quick enough for him to recover it; and I should be glad to learn that the intention of His Majesty's Government is that in such a case the expropriated landlord is not to be subject to any hardship.

I think those are about all the questions that I desire information upon. I can assure your Lordships that I do not ask these questions in any carping or cavilling spirit. I am convinced that His Majesty's Government desire that under this Bill the expropriation should be carried out by fair and honest methods; and I only ask these questions to make sure that no class will be injured or damaged. Because it is quite obvious that though the methods may be honest, sound, and fair as regards the price to be paid to the expropriated owner, yet so much inconvenience and loss of money may occur to him by the other and incidental means that I have mentioned, that really the whole transaction may turn out to be one of extreme hardship. I am convinced that His Majesty's Government desire that the Bill should be carried out fairly and honestly; and I cannot imagine for a moment that they really intend that the Estates Commissioners should have power to expropriate any number, or even any single one, of the occupiers who have purchased their holdings under the 1903 Act or the other Acts. And I would appeal to His Majesty's Government whether it is not absolutely necessary to place a limit in some shape upon the power of action of the Estates Commissioners, because that will in itself obviate the difficulties which I have endeavoured to point out may arise on account of the fact that this Bill provides that the Estates Commissioners may draw upon the grant-in-aid, and many other difficulties of that kind? I have not, of course, dealt with details which have got to be dealt with in Committee, and I do not go into them at all in their particulars now. All that I would be glad to elicit from His Majesty's Government, if I could, is an expression that they will themselves in Committee consider these subjects, and introduce Amendments where they are necessary; and, if they do so, and treat Amendments which arise from this side of the House in a sympathetic way, I myself most earnestly hope that not only will the Bill be read a second time, but that it will find a place in the Statute-book this session.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, in the opinion of many noble Lords well acquainted with Ireland this Bill is so unnecessary, and it contains so many singular and absolutely unprecedented provisions, that there was a strong disposition to move its rejection at the present stage. I think that what weighed as much as anything else with these noble Lords, and made them alter their decision, was that the Bill had been so little discussed in another place—it may be said to have passed through without any discussion whatever—that it was thought desirable that it should be fully discussed in your Lordships' House, and not only considered and all its points mentioned, in the Second Reading debate, but that it should be taken clause by clause, and all its details scrutinised, so that its exceedingly objectionable provisions might be thoroughly threshed out and made pubiic.

I have spoken of the Bill as unnecessary. Now I only speak the opinion of those who best know my own part of the country—the West of Ireland—and that is the part of Ireland to which this Bill chiefly applies—when I say that this compulsion is absolutely unnecessary, and that there is plenty of land to be procured by the Estates Commissioners, provided an adequate price is paid for it. It practically all comes to a question of purchasing untenanted land, for whether the evicted tenants are to be placed on the land so acquired, or whether the extremely monstrous proposal is to be carried out of removing the new tenants and replacing the evicted tenants on their former holdings, in either case, whether it is for the evicted tenants or the new tenants, land will have to be found for them; therefore it all turns on the purchase of a sufficient quantity of untenanted land. That has been laid down by the Estates Commissioners as being about 80,000 acres. They say they have enough land in their hands at present—or available—for the purposes of this Bill, but they cannot employ it, because they want it for other purposes. If they have been able to acquire this land voluntarily, what reason is there to suppose that they would not be able to acquire more in the same way? It is a great mistake to think that there is any animus among landlords in general against evicted tenants. I think all are disposed to look with a certain sympathy upon these unfortunate misguided men, who were misled by people who ought to have known better into joining a morally and legally indefensible association, which practically amounted to a conspiracy, and who have, in fact, suffered and been ruined by so doing. We therefore believe, my Lords, that compulsion is not necessary, and we wish to object to it, and to protest against it in any shape or form. But compulsion is the very essence of this Bill. If you take it away, the whole fabric falls to the ground, and therefore it very naturally may be said: "If you think that, why do you not move the rejection of the Second Reading?" It is not only that we object to compulsion, but we object quite as strongly—even more strongly—to the mode in which compulsion is applied by this Bill, and we consider it a most serious matter, because although it is now applied over a considerable, but still, limited extent, and for a certain purpose, it is not at all unlikely that it may be applied on a much larger scale, and for other purposes hereafter. We received an assurance from the noble Lord the President of the Council that this was not to be taken as a precedent, and that any other case would be decided on its merits. But it may be discovered by His Majesty's Government next year, or the year after, that the settlement of the people whom it may be thought desirable to transplant from the congested districts—is a matter of such importance as to cause them to bring in a Bill on the same lines as this for the settlement of these people who most certainly are deserving of compassion, because of the wretched way in which many of them are now living.

Lord Clonbrock.

As I say, we object not only to compulsion, but to the manner in which the compulsion is applied. I need not repeat the objections. They have been fully stated by the noble Marquess on the Front Bench and equally by the noble and learned Lord who spoke after him. Both noble Lords laid down that it was an utterly unprecedented proceeding that the Commissioners should not only settle on the purchase, but should fix the price, and without any sort of appeal. I want to ask, is it probable—is it even possible—that an honest price can be arrived at under these crcumstances? I do not for a moment mean to impute any *mala fides* to the Estates Commissioners, but they are the people who have got money to lay out, and everybody who has got money to lay out in buying anything wants to buy as cheaply as possible, to make as good a bargain as possible, with the money in hand, and to consider what he is to do afterwards with the purchase which he has made. That is what the Estates Commissioners do, and what they ought to do. They make the best bargain they can, and we know that they do it with a view to the future, because it has been pointed out by the noble and learned Lord that when they are about to purchase land, they look not to the value which the vendor has been receiving, but to the price at which they will be able to dispose of it. That is to say, they believe that the purchaser to whom they intend to sell it—the tenant purchaser—can only pay a much smaller sum than the landlord has been receiving for the land as a grass farm. This would seem to confirm a view I have heard very often expressed in Ireland—that the produce of a large grass farm is of more value than would be the same farm when divided, and that therefore it is an economic mistake to break up a large farm into small holdings. I do not know if that view will commend itself to His Majesty's Government, judging from the legislation which is now pending for other parts of the United Kingdom, but they must anyhow surely acknowledge that it is an unfair proceeding that the landord should only be paid at the rate at which the Estates Commissioners think they can re-sell it, and not at the rent which he is receiving.

I rather think that the Estates Commissioners who took this view introduced a sort of corrective by saying that they would give the landlord a sufficient number of years' purchase so as to amount to a sum which, when invested in a security equal to Irish land, would give him his present income. There would appear to be a certain irony about that comparison with Irish land, for undoubtedly, with legislation such as this which is now before us, and with the state of agitation in Ireland which, from the light and airy way in which the authorities treated it at the outset has now advanced to a most dangerous extent, Irish land cannot be considered to be a gilt-edged security, or anything like it.

I have only spoken hitherto about the injustice to landlords, but I should like most strongly to support what fell from the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lansdowne) and from the noble and learned Lord (Lord Atkinson) as to the extreme injustice of the treatment that it is proposed in the Bill to mete out to the new tenants. I have had no direct relations with any of the new tenants, because I do not happen to have either evicted tenants or new tenants, but there are a considerable number in my own county, and I have taken the trouble to inform myself about the condition of these men, from what I can learn, they are, as a rule a solvent and most respectable set of men, who have been paying their rents, laying out money on their farms, and working them in a proper agricultural manner, and therefore the outcry which is made against them is an extremely unjust one. They are held up to popular obloquy, as planters, land-grabbers and so forth. A land-grabber of course, I hardly need inform your Lordships, is anybody who takes a farm which has become vacant from any cause, the theory apparently being that a man ought to hold a farm for ever, whether he pays his rent or not, and anybody that comes in is called a land-grabber and an enemy of the human race. These men, I have every reason to believe, are working their farms in a proper manner, and are most deserving of support. I will not take up your Lordships' time further; I am sensible that everything I have said is merely a repetition of what has been said by the noble Lords who have preceded me, and who have said it a great deal better. It is only because of the fact that I am living in the West of Ireland that I desire to submit to your Lordships' House this view in support of what has been said by other noble Lords. There are other points which we object to in this Bill which have already been brought before the House, and I will not trespass any longer upon your Lordships' time.

LORD BARRYMORE: My Lords, after the able and eloquent speeches which we have heard from my friends around me who have dealt so fully with the Bill, there appears to be very little left for anyone to say. One does not like to reiterate the criticisms which have been made upon the Bill, but one cannot help feeling that this is a Bill of a most extraordinary and drastic kind. It is a Bill that we all feel bound to protest against in every possible way, and as loudly as we can. It is a compulsory Bill with a novel machinery, a Bill which will probably form a very dangerous precedent in dealing with land in the future, beyond the work that it is intended to do on this occasion. It makes the Estates Commissioners both parties and judges in their own case; it enables them to take land and to fix their own price for it without any appeal except to themselves, and by the 13th Section, I think it is, of the Bill they are to be freed from the control and criticism of Parliament. I think that is so novel and far-reaching a measure that it ought to be sufficient to condemn it without anything further, without taking into consideration the fact that it is likely to cost the country an expense of from £2,000,000 to £2,500,000.

Mr. Birrell, in the other House, when he introduced this Bill, said that it was an enabling Bill—that it was to enable Parliament to keep faith with the Irish people. I really do not know what he meant, but it certainly is not a Bill to keep faith with itself, and to stick to the agreement which was come to in the year 1903, because that agreement was of a voluntary kind, and on a voluntary basis; compulsion was carefully eliminated and kept out of it. I always understood that land purchase and reinstatement of evicted tenants was to go on *pari passu*. The noble Lord, Lord Dunraven, said just now that as far as the Land Conference is concerned (and the Land Conference and the agreement in Parliament afterwards are two distinct things) that was not so. But at any rate it was certainly understood in Parliament that they were to go more or less hand in hand, and this is a violation, I maintain, of the agreement come to in 1903.

Then there is the question of the trenching upon the bonus, which has been adverted to by noble Lords on two or three occasions this evening and was very fully dealt with by the Earl of Dunraven. The noble Earl the Lord President of the Council said in his speech that it would be a very small thing, and that the whole amount that the bonus would be trenched upon would be only £100,000. Let the noble Earl put that figure in the Bill. I object to its being trenched upon at all, but at any rate let us know exactly where we stand, and do not let the remainder—the whole balance of this bonus, or grant-in-aid fund, I think it was called—be left for the Commissioners to trench upon and deal with as they please.

What is the necessity for this Bill? I cannot see myself that there is any necessity for it at all. Has the Act of 1903 failed? On the contrary, the Act of 1903 has gone a great deal faster, both as regards the purchase operations and also as regards the reinstatement of evicted tenants, than it was expected to go. There appears to me to be no reason whatever why such a measure as this should be introduced, for the only justification for its being introduced would have been that the Act of 1903 had failed. Now with regard to the number of these evicted tenants. Mr. O'Malley said in 1899, when he introduced a Bill on this question, that there were 400 Plan of Campaign tenants out. Another authority said he thought there were 1,000, and Mr. Gerald Balfour, at that time the Chief Secretary, gave a still higher figure. In 1900 Mr. John Redmond dealt with the question, and gave yet a different number, and in 1903 Mr. Dillon, who I think ought to be the best authority of them all, because he is the gentleman who I have always understood has had control of the Land League Funds, and has had to pay the pensions to these evicted tenants—Mr. Dillon said that in 1894 there were 800 of them, but since then about half of them had disappeared through death and emigration and other causes, and that there were then (in 1903) about 400, and that the whole question could be settled for about £200,000. Mr. Dillon, as I say, is a gentleman likely to know. And what has happened since 1903? Why, we have it on the Report of the Commissioners that over 1,000 of these tenants have been reinstated. That must clearly include, on the statement of the Commissioners, all the Plan of Campaign tenants who have been reinstated, excepting those upon the estate of the noble Marquess who, I understand, is to address your Lordships presently (the Marquess of Clanricarde) and a few—some thirty—upon the estate of Mr. Lewis, who has been perfectly willing to sell if he could only get what the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack calls an honest price.

My Lords, who are these people who will come under the operation of this Bill? They are not Plan of Campaign tenants, with the exception of those two estates alone, and one surely cannot think that His Majesty's Government had brought in a measure such as this, which is to operate throughout the whole of Ireland, and to put the land of every landlord, and of every planter, and I do not know who else, at the mercy of the Estates Commissioners, because two estates in the west of Connaught have not been settled since the Act of 1903. That surely is impossible. But then who are the tenants who are likely to come in under this Bill? They must be the ordinary tenants who have failed in the ordinary business of life—men whose position has been since 1881 amply safeguarded—who could only be turned out because they had not paid their rent—who had failed in business simply because they were ignorant, or intemperate, or incapable, and had failed in business, as other very excellent, but no doubt incapable people are very apt to do. We may be sorry for them, no doubt, and I am very sorry for many of them, but that is no reason why they should be given a further chance at the public expense. If you admit such a principle as that, I do not see why every broken down shopkeeper—the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker—should not ask to be put back into their businesses, and ask for a dole out of the public exchequer to set them on their legs again. But I do not think that that can be the intention of His Majesty's Government; I do not think His Majesty's Government can intend that those men are going to be reinstated. We had a most interesting little debate in this House the other day, started by my noble friend Lord Donoughmore; and a very interesting speech was made by the Lord President in answer to my noble friend. In the course of that speech he made these remarks, which I thought were extremely interesting, and with which I very fully agree:—

> "I think it is important to draw a distinction between an evicted tenant and a tenant who has been evicted. Evicted tenant has become—I am sorry it should be so—almost a technical term; and what I think is clearly understood by evicted tenants, when they are spoken of as a class in Ireland, are those who have lost their holdings owing to the agrarian disputes which have existed in that country, and that therefore, when there was a desire that there should be a general eirenicon at the time of the Land Bill—as Mr. Wyndham said, that bygones should be bygones—these men were to be treated on precisely the same terms as those who were tenants of farms. But no one ever imagined that, when evicted tenants were thus spoken of, every man who had lost his farm, whether it was because he was an impossible tenant, or a bad farmer, or a generally undesirable person, should necessarily be reinstated.

THE EARL OF CREWE: Hear, hear!

LORD BARRYMORE: Then the noble Earl went on to say—

> "You have only to study the debates on this subject to see that, when the Irish Members of Parliament spoke of evicted tenants, it was to those who had suffered in the land war that they confined their remarks."

That is admirable; but those men have been put back already; and the men who will come under this Bill are the very undesirable and worthless people whom the noble Earl says nobody wants back. If the noble Earl will limit the scope of the Bill to those whom he calls "evicted tenants," and will put a definition in the Bill to that effect, I admit it will very largely modify my hostility towards it.

Then there comes the question of compulsory powers. Are compulsory powers necessary? The Estates Commissioners have already got compulsory powers; at any rate, if they have not got them, they exercise them. As the noble and learned Lord, Lord Atkinson, told your Lordships a little while ago, and as I myself can vouch, on many estates the Commissioners intimate to the vendors that unless such and such evicted tenants are reinstated they will not declare the property an estate, and therefore the bonus will not attach to it. There are a number of cases I could quote where evicted tenants have been reinstated under pressure from the Commissioners. I do not say it is wrong, but there it is. The Commissioners have got those powers, and they exercise them now; and I say that to ask for further compulsory powers is a most unnecessary thing, because they have already got compulsory powers which are quite sufficient, and I say that, even with the power they have got, they have reinstated a very large number of evicted tenants, and might have reinstated more. I know one estate down in my part of the world where, ever since the Act of 1903 was passed, the owners, those who have to manage the estate, have been endeavouring to sell the remainder of the estate to the Estates Commissioners, so that certain evicted tenants were there for life. I am alluding to the Ponsonby Estate. I am glad to see that in their Report they state that an agreement has now been entered into, and that it is to be purchased. But if the Estates Commissioners had hurried it a little more they might have bought the remainder of that estate three years ago and the men who had been evicted might have been reinstated long ago. I got a letter a day or two ago from an agent in Cork, a friend of mine, and he writes asking why the Estates Commissioners do not reinstate in cases where the landlords are willing. He mentions two cases on one estate where he says he accepted the inspector's valuation and purchase price six months ago, yet where nothing has been done so far about reinstating. I have no doubt that up and down the country there are plenty of cases where the landlords want to sell, where they have evicted tenants on the property, and where they are perfectly willing to put them back now that the properties have been sold. I suppose it is partly owing to the fact that the Commissioners have not got the money; but it is certain that the delays are, to the lay mind, the outside mind, the mind of the landlord who owns the property, most tedious and most unnecessary. There are 80,000 acres wanted to be purchased for the purpose of reinstating those tenants. There is a good deal of land to be had, no doubt, as grazing land in the west—Roscommon and elsewhere. Down in the South of Ireland, where I live, there is very little. What land there is, is in the hands of occupying owners, who have acquired the land and are farming it themselves. Sometimes, of course, tenants have had to be evicted, and sometimes they have gone owing large sums of arrears. In some cases the tenant right has actually been purchased; in other cases—my own, for instance—I have acquired in that sort of way the land round the town, in order that, for the benefit and development of the town, one might be able to have the land in one's own hands. As far as I can see, down in the South, the people whose lands have been taken would be the people who have land which has been held by landlords, and which has been farmed and worked by those landlords. There is a certain number of derelict farms, but those really nowadays are very few. But it would not only be a great hardship, but a great injustice to the landlords who are working these farms—farms which are outside the demesne, it may be some miles off, possibly, but which are worked in conjunction—if their lands were taken from them to put evicted tenants upon. And, I venture to submit, it would be a very great misfortune to the country generally, because I do not suppose that anybody wants to drive out of the country landlords who are living in the country, who are spending their money there, who are working at their farms, and so forth, because those farms are probably the best cultivated farms in their neighbourhood; they set a good example to their neighbours, they probably employ a good deal more labour than an ordinary tenant-farmer does, the cottages and buildings are generally in very good order; and I think it would be a very great misfortune to the country if men of that kind—and there are a great many of them—ceased to exist. I think they ought to be encouraged to remain in the country, instead of being discouraged, as they undoubtedly will be if their farms are taken away from them for this or any other purpose.

I do not want to detain your Lordships, but the question of there being no limit to the operation of the Bill appears to be a very serious and unfortunate one. The Lord President gave us some rather elaborate reasons in his speech this evening why there should be no limit. I admit that he did not convince me, but it seems to me that, unless there be some limit, you never will, and never can, have a settlement of such a question as this. There will be fresh complications from people calling themselves "evicted tenants," coming from America, New Zealand, and everywhere, for years to come. It will be as bad as the case of the "Veterans" in the United States, who, I am told, are still being born every day. Unless there be some limit, either of number, or of acreage, or of time, I am am sure it will be a very great misfortune and a very great mistake.

I do not know that I need make any more tedious remarks about the Bill, but I do not think there is any real serious demand in Ireland for such a measure at all. There is a sort of idea which has got about in Ireland, and it is a thing which has been encouraged during late years by Governments and Parties giving way and bending too much before the popular Press and before popular bogies, popular clamour. If, when Mr. John Morley was in office in 1894, he had put his foot down, I believe the whole evicted tenant question would have disappeared by now, and you would have heard no more about it. But he did not do so; and the result has been that of late years a sort of idea has grown up throughout the country that a new wave of confiscation was coming. Throughout centuries there have been property confiscations in Ireland, and that country is no more peaceful and happy now than it was in the days of Queen Elizabeth. But that is the sort of idea which occurs in the minds of the people of Ireland. This is a bogus and officially-created agitation; it is got up by one set of men for political purposes, and it is advanced and supported by others—farmers who have lost their farms through their own indolence and their own incapacity. It is a great misfortune that such an agitation should be fostered and encouraged by the Government, and by the great Liberal Party standing behind them. I cannot help feeling myself that they are only encouraging such an agitation by their attitude, and that it will be more difficult in the future to settle either this question or any other similar one arising out of it. I am afraid that harm will result if this measure passes. I hope it will not pass without being seriously amended, but I am afraid that even then it will do a great deal more mischief than it will do good.

THE EARL OF ARRAN: My Lords, my noble friend Lord Barrymore, who has just spoken, said that he regretted to have to repeat arguments which had been already used. I venture, with all deference, to disagree with him, because I think the arguments against this measure are so strong that they will bear repetition. I think it should be recognised that the landlords all over Ireland object very strongly to the measure in the shape in which it now is.

I hold no antagonistic brief against the cause of the evicted tenants. If the reinstatement of the evicted tenants is to bring about peace and contentment to Ireland, let every tenant who has ever been evicted be reinstated, so long as it is not done at the expense of injustice to somebody else. It has been contended that the reinstatement of evicted tenants formed part of the agreement of 1903. All the landlords with whom I have discussed this question are only too anxious to carry out, not only in the letter but in the spirit, the terms of that agreement; and, that being so, I think we must remember that every agreement has two sides, and that if we carry out the agreement both in the letter and in the spirit, it is only fair that the other side should carry out the agreement at least in the letter. That agreement, as far as I understood it, and I think as far as most of us understood it, was that as, under the Land Purchase scheme, estates were sold, so would evicted tenants be reinstated; and it was agreed, upon the part of the landlords, that if no compulsion was brought upon them to sell, and no compulsion—and even more stress was laid upon this—was brought upon the planters to leave the holdings which they had taken up, the landlords would do all they could to reinstate the evicted tenants. If the landlords had failed to keep to the terms of this agreement or understanding, then I think compulsion would be not only just but necessary. I know also that rumour has been busy to the effect that landlords on the whole are either unwilling to reinstate the evicted tenants except on terms which are exorbitant, or are unwilling to reinstate their evicted tenants at all. There may be a few cases of such a kind; but I venture to ask of His Majesty's Government that someone will, to-night, show us a sufficient number of concrete cases to prove that the landlords as a whole have refused to keep to their bargain, so as to justify the compulsion which has been brought into this Bill.

I believe it is also argued that the evicted tenants are not being reinstated sufficiently quickly. But we are passing through great constitutional changes in Ireland, and great constitutional changes cannot be carried out in a moment. As estates are sold under the Land Act, so will the evicted tenants be reinstated; but if you carry on their reinstatement in a hurry, or try and do it all in a moment, you run great risk of doing injustice to other people; and it is not fair that you should indulge one class at the expense of another. I think if the Estates Commissioners would confine themselves to carrying out as far as they are able those agreements for which there is money, and which have already been made under the Land Purchase Act, evicted tenants would be reinstated for all practical purposes sufficiently quickly, while the far greater problem, namely, the problem of delay in land purchase, would be more rapidly solved.

But let us turn for a moment to the other side, to another view of the question of compulsion—I mean, as it affects the planters. Under this Bill, you are giving to the Estates Commissioners power to turn men out of their holdings, men who have honestly and courageously striven to do their duty, and to put into their places (we are asked by the Lord President of the Council not to use any hard terms, and I do not wish to do so) men who have either failed to make successes of the farms which they at present occupy, or men who have not recognised the necessity of fulfilling the contracts which they have undertaken. I know that under this Bill compensation is to be given in the shape either of money or of another farm to those planter tenants who are turned out under this Bill. But I do not think the money that would be given by the Estates Commissioners would be sufficient to compensate men for being turned out of their homes — men who have been living there, perhaps, twenty-five years—through no fault of their own. It has been already said by Lord Atkinson and Lord Lansdowne, and is surely well known in Ireland, that migrants, as they are called, have to undergo the same odium—the same disagreeable treatment in their new surroundings—as was experienced by the planter tenants when they first took their residence in the holdings they now occupy. The Estates Commissioners, I believe, say it is not fair to expect the tenants to undergo these difficulties; but I think from the point of view of ordinary justice, if you have got to choose between the men who have failed and the men who have succeeded, the men who have carried out their contracts and the men who have not, it is not fair that the faults of the idle man should rest upon what I may call the industrious apprentice.

To return to the question of the understanding as regards these planter tenants, even before that understanding was ratified in an Act of Parliament in 1903, the most enthusiastic supporters of the case of the evicted tenants did not recommend that the planters should be turned out. I read that Mr. John Redmond, who is the leader of the evicted tenants, as he is of all National politics, said that if the planters wished to remain in their present holdings he would not give his sanction to any attempt to turn them out. The noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, has already told us what went on in your Lordships' House as regards this question of the evicted planters. And I may say that on all sides it was universally recognised that the planters should not be turned out, whatever might be done to the evicted tenants. I have not heard, and I do not think any of us have heard, what new lights have been brought to bear on this matter, and why His Majesy's Government have taken an entirely different view from that taken by the whole of Parliament in 1903; and I think we are justified in pressing for a direct answer to that question.

Now, as regards the authority by which this compulsion is to be exercised, I venture to think that never since the neolithic age has there been any case of two men having such powers of compulsory acquisition as are given under this Bill to any two out of the three Estates Commissioners. Not only are they given powers of compulsory acquisition of land, but they are also given power of fixing the price. This has also, I know, been brought up over and over again this evening, but I think it is so strong a proposition to bring into an Act of Parliament that I venture to bring it to the attention of the House again. I have no prejudice in any way against the Estates Commissioners. I believe they are, according to the very strong personal views every man holds, absolutely impartial. Mr. Birrell, in another place, described the Estates Commissioners one as a tenant's man and the other as a landlord's man. Personally, I prefer to hold the view that they are absolutely impartial. But we have heard from the noble and learned Lord (Lord Atkinson) the view put forward that two out of three Estates Commissioners hold powers of compulsory land purchase. And there is another view of Mr. Finucane which the noble Lord did not bring forward. *The Times* of 25th July says that Mr. Finucane's view on the compulsory acquisition of land is this—

> "In taking land from any man, whether it is pasture land or of any other description, it is not a question of what is fair or unfair, so much as a question of what is required in the public interest."

Is it surprising that we who own property in Ireland deeply resent the idea of giving ourselves, as far as that property is affected, body and soul into the hands of two gentlemen who, however impartial they may be, hold such views of land purchase as those quoted by the noble Lord (Lord Atkinson) and that which I have just quoted from *The Times*, and are the representatives—I think I am stating it fairly—of the purchaser of the property in question?

Then, as regards the limits of the Bill, I think we may say that there are no limits—either as to number, as to time, or as to money. Therefore you are giving to two Estates Commissioners absolutely unlimited power of financial control and unlimited power of compulsion, without any power of appeal whatever. I think it is entirely without precedent that you should leave large sums of public money which, as far as I can calculate, may run into well over £1,000,000, without any power of control or any power of criticism such as that which is exercised in Parliament. I do not know who has inspired this Bill, but in every line of it I read teachings which have always been those of the United Irish League, and His Majesty's Government hold the same views. But I am not now speaking so much on behalf of the landlords—I am speaking more on account of the planter tenants. In the case of the landlords I regret to say it, but I believe that before many years are over the whole of the landlord class will have left Ireland, but the evicted planter class, as they will come to be called, cannot leave Ireland unless they emigrate. They have shown by their determination and their industry that they are men whom no country, if they possess them, can afford to do without. The only thing they can do, if they are dispossessed, is to emigrate, to go away from the country. If they emigrate, you are losing some of Ireland's best men; but, if they remain in Ireland, their treatment will remain, during the whole of their lives, as an object lesson to the remainder of the people of Ireland. I know it is said that if this measure does not pass, or, rather, is greatly altered by your Lordships' House, Ireland, enraged by her disappointment, will enter into a fresh campaign of lawlessness and agitation. There may be a fresh campaign of lawlessness and agitation; but I do not believe, whatever may be the fate of this Bill, that that will be the absolute cause. I believe very much indeed in the possibility of a very bad time during the coming winter, but I think that that bad time will arrive just as much from the interpretation which has been placed in Ireland upon many of the Chief Secretary's speeches, and the belief, as I have said before, that His Majesty's Government can be squeezed into further concessions by agitation.

I will not detain your Lordships any longer, excepting to say that I have heard this Bill described, by people who imagine that they understand Ireland, as a proof of the new day that is dawning for Ireland. I believe if this Bill passed in its present form into law, that on the contrary it would be one step in Ireland's degradation; because it would be an illustration of that lesson which has been for the last two years so ardently preached; and the real meaning of that lesson is, that lawlessness and agitation are the sure roads to success, while industry, law abiding, and fair dealing have no claim to reward. I repeat that I am all for the reinstatement of evicted tenants as long as it is not done at the cost of any injustice to anyone else. But I venture to think that this Bill in its present condition does offend against some of the most ordinary canons of justice, and as such, if it passed into law, it would not be fair to anyone, least of all to Ireland herself, and would be much more likely to prove an irritant than a salve.

*THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE: My Lords, as one of the parties intentionally aimed at by this Bill, I should like to point out the somewhat ominous fact that the compulsion which is avowedly the essence of this Bill has already appeared in sinister haste with the gag in another place. That ominous haste would adequately suggest, and be prophetic as, a warning. Seizure officially and by compulsion is always at best so difficult to defend or even to excuse, so liable to abuse, so open to suspicion, and so liable to be made a precedent for further acts worse than felony, that it always requires a most jealous curb. There is no such curb in this Bill. Instead, it gives to any two of these unreliable Commissioners power for which there has been no precedent for hundreds of years; it gives them the power not only to seize land by compulsion, but even more land than is required for the purposes of the Act, and at their own price. Think what that means. They have power to take a single farm on an estate at their own price. That will, in most cases, injure the subsequent sale of the whole estate, and also, by their fixing their own price, which they will probably be bound to fix low, set up an unfairly low standard of quotation for the rest of the locality. They are to have an ambiguous position as to tenure. As far as one can understand, the tenure is to be perpetual—that of a County Court Judge, and at the same time something entirely different from that. Whether the suitable epithet for that tenure would be epicene or bisexual, or amphibious or what not, certainly seems to suggest and invite further elucidation. They are also to have the power of issuing their own warrant—not that of a court to the sheriff for possession. Even the worst and most tyrannical acts of the worst times—even the old Tower of London—are not in it. They might actually smother the cries of their victims with an appeal to themselves as effectually as with the Malmsey butt. The one tenable defence of official seizure by compulsion is, that the man must give way to the many, as in the case of railways. If land is taken from an individual for railway purposes, it is excused on the ground of advantage to the general public. That defence does not hold good with regard to this Bill. Each of these acts of seizure is to be exclusively for the benefit of one single individual—as it happens, the evicted tenant. No other person on God's earth is to benefit; while, on the other hand, at least two persons, both the landowner and the planter, will be prejudiced in what is called their rights of citizenship. Past evictions are to be remedied by more evictions on a colossal scale quite unprecedented as coming from any one single quarter. The planter is to be rooted up. He will object to going out of his actual holding; others will equally object to his going into his new holding. On my own land, I know that part of it within the scope of the Act is coveted already by the small tenants around to enlarge their own holdings in case of a change. They emphatically resent, and would oppose, the intrusion either of evicted tenants or of planters—a sort of pandemonium of discontent.

We have been asked to sympathise with the planters and to defend them. I fully concur; they do deserve it. At the time of the Wyndham Act, the noble Marquess, I think it was, spoke up for them sympathetically and tersely, and I, for one, wished to thank him for the hope which I think he expressed that no Irish landowner would countenance the extrusion of the planters and the substitution of evicted tenants. He hit the nail on the head; and it is permissible to hope that his firmness and consistency are also of the same fine temper. The present Bill does violate the Wyndham Act. I myself should certainly have opposed it—and I have something to do with it I am sure—had it not been made abundantly clear, that it was to be optional without compulsion. One of the devices to float this Bill has been to conjure with the blessed word eirenicon. Eirenicon, I think, is the correct term. Unfortunately these Irish sops do not satiate, but whet, greed. In the case of the last Irish sop, the Town Tenants Act, passed only a few months back, hardly was the ink dry than this new sop was immediately demanded also. Another device has been to raise up bygones, in the name of bygones being bygones, and stale slanders against landowners, and to paint the evicted tenant as an injured lamb or something of that kind. It may not therefore be amiss to fortify our recollection by a passing glance at the bad record of these "Plan of Campaigners" themselves. They demanded on one Campaign estate that holdings and tenancies with rents 30 per cent. below the Government valuation should be cut down an additional 50 per cent. Hundreds of them paid, or professed to pay their rent to the Campaign "war chest," instead of to their creditor. A number of them, fifty-nine I think, insisted upon being evicted to live on the Campaign funds, though known to be able to pay, as many of them boasted. A still larger number owed from five to ten years rent, which was between 20 and 30 per cent. below the valuation. But as one individual case speaks a clearer language than a general statement, a tenant named Michael Moran publicly apologised for having, nearly two years earlier, paid something on account to his creditors, and in atonement he at the same time gave the League fund three years' rent. He had, moreover, on his farm at the same time live stock equal to eleven more years rent, which was 45 per cent. below the Government valuation. The wholesale repudiation of exceptionally low rents was backed up by violence—such violence as to preclude wholesale reinstatement, though it was more difficult for the owner to find new tenants for a number of farms than for only a few.

Such facts I contend—and fairly contend as I believe—are a sufficient protest against the sacrifice of the planters to the Plan of Campaigners. This Bill will set on a pedestal and be the apotheosis of that most gigantic conspiracy to swindle, the Plan of Campaign, and will enable its instigators to establish its pretension that bygones are never to be bygones until every verdict against them, however just, has been reversed into one in their favour. We have been summoned to trust the official Commissioners. Such juggling with the confidence trick is rebutted by the official confiscation of the Land Court of 1881. Those confiscations have impaired confidence in the official arbitrators *et hoc genus omne*, has impaired also their trustworthiness and lowered and dwarfed the tone and quality of honesty in such matters. We have been invited also from another quarter to cure the evils of this Bill by Amendments and talk. Surely prevention is better than cure, as for instance in the case of a fire in our art collections. Prevention is sound; cure is doubtful, even a cure when it is perfect and permanent, and in such an Augean stable as this Bill, Amendments are simply synonymous with the Partington mop. The one pleasing feature—the only clear patch in the dirty sky of our legislative daub—is that it would at length deck the brow of the gentleman in charge of it, Mr. Augustine Birrell, with those legislative bay-leaves which have hitherto untowardly eluded his ardent pursuit. But even such blessings may be bought too dear, and even Mr. Birrell himself may become too expensive a luxury at the price of a Bill so tainted with an inept callous levity of despotism unworthy of any sane Government accountable for the liberty of any free people.

VISCOUNT MASSEREENE: My Lords, at this late hour I must apologise for saying a few words, but what I wish to say is this. Both political Parties of this realm agreed on the principle of the restoration of the evicted tenant. At the same time, the whole question is one to be discussed, and the point we all object to in this Bill is compulsion, and compulsion without appeal. That, it seems to me, is the critical point of the Bill. We landlords in Ireland, as well as every other part of the community, have at heart the peace and prosperity of the country to which we belong, and there is no spirit of hostile criticism in what has been said from these benches to-night. We say what we have said because we believe it is for the good of the country. I want to say one word with reference to what are called the planter tenants, and I do so because I have had during the last year practical experience of dealing with them. As noble Lords from my country know perfectly well, my estate has been a Plan of Campaign estate, and it is only in the last few months that the whole thing has been settled and that the evicted tenants are being put back on that estate. The view I took, and the view I hold now, and always shall hold, is that no evicted tenant is to be put back at the expense of anyone else. That seems to me to be the only just and reasonable procedure. I have had many a talk with these planter-tenants about this question; they were men who had borne the burden and heat of the day. When they first went there, they first of all had to be protected; they could not sell their crops, they could not sell their stock. They had lived all that down and were living at peace and charity with their neighbours. The question came to me when I came into the property, How was this question to be got over? Well, it was a voluntary settlement. It was done solely by compensation, and I venture to state that if this House passes this Bill, which enables the Estates Commissioners to force the planter-tenant to go, and to give him land elsewhere, or to compensate him, not a single planter-tenant in Ireland will take land. I do not see how he possibly can. These men said with perfect truth, "We are marked men in Ireland. We cannot go anywhere." The only place they can go to is the North of Ireland—and there is no land there for them. I venture to state that the Government must compensate these men and compensate them very heavily. They are law-abiding men. I do not say a word against the evicted tenant; he is a man who has been misguided, misinformed, and mis-directed in every way, but these planters are men to whom I am quite sure His Majesty's Government does not wish to do any injury; they are men of sterling worth—otherwise they would not be where they are at the present moment; they would not have lived down what they have done, and I do earnestly hope that when this Bill is considered in Committee a clause will be put in giving them full and ample compensation for their trouble and all the hard times they have had. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything else. All the other points have been far more ably dealt with by those more competent to speak than myself; but I feel very strongly on this point—that the planters should be given every facility and all the compensation they are fully entitled to have for all the hard times they have been through.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I do not rise to take part in this debate from any exhilarating sensation which I derive from the process, but rather because it has been represented to me that there have been few speakers on this side of the House, and that the eloquence of noble Lords from Ireland demands that some arguments should be put forward on this side of the House which, with that prowess in debate for which they are so famous, they will presently proceed to knock down and trample upon.

I would like, before offering any arguments of my own, to say one word with regard to the speech to which we have just listened, of the noble and gallant Viscount, Lord Massereene. I am not going to enter into any of the ordinary compliments which are generally paid from the Table of this House upon the occasion of a noble Lord making, as I understand the noble and gallant Viscount has made to-night, his maiden speech; and I do not do so because, as the noble Lord and myself were cadets at Sandhurst together, he might think that any such proceeding on my part would savour of presumption. But I may perhaps voice the opinion of the House when I say that we are aware of the gallant service which he has rendered the country, more particularly in the South African war, and now that he has left the service, and that it is, I believe, his intention to take part in the ordinary work of this House, we welcome the assistance and co-operation which I believe it is his intention to give us in carrying on that work.

I do not propose to endeavour to reply to the speech to which we have just listened from Lord Clanricarde, who I think has now left the House. Lord Clanricarde and myself have entirely different views with regard to property and the rights of property, and I would only say that I differ from nearly everything that the noble Lord told the House. I am glad to think that as noble Lords opposite are not going to divide the House on the Second Reading, there is after all no very great difference between us with regard to principle in this matter, and I am enboldened in that belief by reading what Mr. Walter Long said in another place in speaking on the Report Stage of the Bill. He said—

> "On the contrary, they accepted the view that the evicted tenants were to be reinstated, and the Motion of his friend had not denied that it might be necessary to resort to compulsion in certain cases."

He goes on, it is fair to state, to object to the manner in which compulsion is exercised in portions of the Bill. But I gather from that that at any rate there is no very great difference between both sides of the House with regard to the principle of this measure. I understand that noble Lords from Ireland fear that this particular Bill may be taken as a precedent for further land legislation with regard to Ireland. I think after the assurance which was given in his opening remarks by the Lord President they may rest content that no such course is contemplated by His Majesty's Government—that if ever the question of taking land compulsorily should arise again, the case would certainly be argued upon its own merits and without any reference to anything which may have been done in this particular Bill. I maintain that the whole thing is exceptional. The Land Act of 1903 was exceptional. It was the result of an entirely exceptional agreement between parties who are generally found in rather bitter opposition. And the case of the evicted tenants is exceptional, even when you are dealing with the exceptional case of the Land Act of 1903. The Land Act of 1903 was designed to put an end, if possible, to agrarian agitation in Ireland, and also to transfer the land, or the bulk of the land, in Ireland from one class to another class in that country. I had to point out to the House the other day a flaw in the Act of 1903, or what threatened to be a flaw, with regard to its financial provisions, which might prevent the first-named object being carried out, and the necessity for this Bill arises because it has been found that it had failed to carry out one of the objects which was designed by the Act of 1903—namely, to restore the evicted tenants of Ireland. I am perfectly well aware that a considerable number of tenants have already been reinstated, and it is true that the number which the Estates Commissioners now propose to reinstate is far larger than that which was originally contemplated some years ago. I think the reason—or one reason at all events—is to be found in the fact that some years ago it would have been only, I think, about 800 people who were contemplated as being necessary to reinstate. But that was an estimate which was formed without any actual inquiries. I believe this is the first actual inquiry which has been held on that point, and therefore I think it is not a criticism that we need be afraid of, that some years ago only a certain number of evicted tenants were proposed to be reinstated, and that now we find it necessary to reinstate a very much larger number than was contemplated at that time.

With regard to the numbers which have been fixed upon by the Estates Commissioners, we have been attacked by noble Lords in this House because the number of 2,000, which they estimate will be the number restored under this Bill, is too high, and we are attacked by Nationalists in another place because that number is far too low. I think the mere fact that we are attacked in this way by two opposing authorities is an argument—I do not say a conclusive argument, but it does at all events go to show that the number the Estates Commissioners have fixed upon is a fair and reasonable number.

I think it was Lord Barrymore who raised the point that a large number of men have returned from America and the Colonies in order to take advantage of the privileges afforded by this Bill. I understand that that is not the case, but that only in about half-a-dozen cases, as far as I know, have the men returned specially from America and other parts of the world in order to be able to take advantage of the provisions of this Bill.

Lord Dunraven also raised many other points, to one or two of which I will endeavour to give a reply. He said that he objected to any money being taken in order to finance this Act from the Land Purchase Aid Fund. Some £12,000,000 altogether will eventually, I presume, be paid by the British taxpayer for the operations of the Land Act of 1903, and surely it is not very much to ask that the comparatively small sum—the almost insignificant sum—of somewhere about

£100,000 might be allowed to be taken from the £12,000,000 for the purpose of restoring the evicted tenants of Ireland. Then Lord Dunraven emphasised a point which I think was also raised by Lord Lansdowne—that the tenants who have purchased holdings under the Act of 1903 might be displaced by the provisions of this Bill. I am informed that that is not the case; nothing is said about it in this Bill, because it does not require to be said.

LORD ASHBOURNE: Why?

LORD DENMAN: I will endeavour to explain. It is because you cannot buy land subject to a land purchase annuity unless that annuity is redeemed, and therefore the planter who has purchased his holding under those terms cannot be put out of his holding without his own consent. I think that is the answer to that point.

LORD ASHBOURNE: There is no saving of that kind in the Bill.

LORD DENMAN: It is not in the Bill, because it does not require to be in the Bill. It is dealt with by the ordinary law of the land.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: This may be a Land Act which supersedes an earlier one, without some safeguard.

LORD DENMAN: I think I am right.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Has the noble Lord the reference for what he says?

LORD DENMAN: No, I am afraid I have not got the reference. Does the noble Lord mean the reference in the Land Act of 1903?

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I mean whatever it is that the noble Earl relies on—can he give us the reference to the clause in the Act he relies on?

LORD DENMAN: I had the reference just now, but I do not think I have it for the moment.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: Perhaps the noble Lord will give it to us later.

LORD DENMAN: I can give it to the noble Lord directly. I had it just now. I do not think it can be as the noble and learned Lord would suggest, because an Amendment was moved in the Commons to enable you, under the Bill, to remove planters who had purchased their holdings, and that Amendment was resisted by the Government. I do not, therefore, think that it can be as the noble and learned Lord would suggest.

Then I come to another question, with which I will deal very briefly—the question of planters. We have been severely criticised in many parts of the House because certain planters may be displaced by the provisions of the Bill. I maintain that the interests of the planters are, after all, carefully safeguarded. If they are displaced, they are given equally good holdings elsewhere, or they are given monetary compensation, and I think it is obvious—and I think it has been stated—that if they prefer to take monetary compensation, that compensation will be given them on a generous scale. I quite admit that there is no precedent in any Act of Parliament for what it is proposed to do with the planters under this Bill. But there are many cases in which the planters are not suitable persons to be occupiers of land. There are many cases in which they have no great knowledge or experience of agriculture, and where their holdings are not improved—or at all events there are some cases—and they might certainly be better off for many obvious reasons, because they may be unpopular or they might possibly be better off in other holdings in other parts of the country. There are cases, I am informed, where the planters still require police protection. In that case, surely it is obvious that they must be centres of disturbance and agitation in those particular localities, and that it would be to the interests of law and order in Ireland if holdings could be found for these men elsewhere or monetary compensation afforded to them.

I will only deal with one more point, and the House may think that I am rather rash and foolhardy to attempt it. Still, I should like to endeavour to make some answer to the speech which was made by the noble and learned Lord, Lord Atkinson, in which he made what appeared to me to be rather a bitter attack upon the Estates Commissioners. With regard to the Estates Commissioners being the tribunal under this Bill, I assert that I do not see where any better tribunal could have been found. These men have been dealing with questions of land for the last four years. They are experts in the valuation of land, and in estimating the price of land in Ireland, and if you had searched over the whole of the Empire I maintain that you could not have found three men who were better qualified to estimate the price and the value of Irish land. No Member of this House has yet offered any alternative suggestion with the exception of Lord Atkinson, and I think his suggestion was that we should follow the precedent of the Act of 1870, when appeal would be to a Judge, and the case would be tried by a Judge and jury.

LORD ATKINSON: Not a jury.

LORD DENMAN: No doubt I am wrong on that point, but I rather question whether Judges are likely to be better, or can possibly have nearly such expert knowledge in questions concerning the value of land, as these men who have been doing it, and doing it very fairly and very well, for some years past. But what seemed to me, I confess, rather unfair in the remarks of the noble and learned Lord was that he took out points from the evidence given before a Commission which has not yet reported, to show that Mr. Finucane particularly was a most unsuitable person to have anything to do with these questions at all.

LORD ATKINSON: Surely the Report cannot alter the evidence?

LORD DENMAN: I quite agree that the Report cannot alter the evidence, and I will try and show the House from the evidence that Mr. Finucane is not the kind of person which the noble and learned Lord represents him to be. For instance, in the statement which he made in his evidence, Mr. Finucane said, at page 135—

> "As to tenanted land, I think that if the State, in the public interest, and in pursuance of public policy, calls upon an owner of land to sell it whether he wishes to do so or not, the State is bound to pay him a full and even generous price for it."

That is one point. And then again, Mr. Finucane says—

> "In determining the price of untenanted land I would have regard, as in the case of tenanted land, first, to the net income actually obtained by the owner during the preceding ten years; secondly, to the precariousness or stability of that income; and, thirdly, to what the land would let for, to a solvent tenant."

Naturally, of course (it is almost ludicrous to have to state it), the Estates Commissioners take the question of intimidation into consideration, and if I were better read in this evidence, I should be able to show that this is the case—that where land is vacant owing to intimidation, naturally the Estates Commissioners give that question very fair and ample consideration. Then I think Lord Arran quoted a passage in Mr. Finucane's evidence where he said that a man might receive £2 an acre for eleven months, but a yearly tenant might only pay for that, say, £1 an acre. There was no definite statement of any kind that that was the opinion of Mr. Finucane. With all respect, I think that is an unfair suggestion to make with regard to a distinguished public servant. As I say, if I were better versed in these matters, and if I had a tithe of the ability of the noble and learned Lord opposite, and of his training, I should be able to put this case very much more forcibly to this House than I am able to do. But in conclusion I will only say that I do not pretend for a moment that this is by any means a perfect Bill, or one incapable of Amendment. I understand that it is to pass through Second Reading to-night. I can only hope that when we get to the Committee stage, the precedent of the Education Bill of last year will not be followed, and that the Bill will not be battered out of recognition. It seems to me that this is an honest and straightforward endeavour to grapple with an extremely thorny and complicated question, and as such I commend it to the attention of your Lordships' House.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, we have heard many fair promises from the benches opposite, but I must draw your attention to one thing before dealing with the Bill as it stands before us, and that is that there does not seem to be an agreement among the occupants of the Front Bench with regard to the appeal. I noticed that Lord Denman said that he was quite satisfied with the Estates Commissioners as the parties to settle everything; they were to buy, to sell, to decide what is to be done in every way with our land and with the planters' land. The noble Lord the Lord President said he wanted to hear an Amendment as to an appellate tribunal. I will let it stand there, and when the time comes that Amendment will be submitted to the noble Lord.

With regard to this question of the evicted tenant, it came before me for the first time in my life when I was a member of the Land Conference, and it originated in a paragraph of which I should like to remind the House. It was this—that any project for the solution of the Irish land question should be accompanied by a settlement of the evicted tenants question upon an equitable basis. I must freely state that if there had been any idea of compulsion put forward at that Land Conference, it would have broken up the Conference, and prevented all the good that accrued from that Conference; and I must also tell your Lordships that at that time it was considered by the Nationalists—and I defy them to deny it—and by ourselves, that the evicted tenants question was not that enormous question which it suddenly loomed up as being in consequence of the Report of the Estates Commissioners. The arrangement was embodied in the Act of 1903, and the foundations of that Act were based upon the principle that all transactions under it should be voluntary, and that compulsion should be excluded from them. All parties in Ireland, I must remind your Lordships, agree to that, and as estates came up for sale, the question was dealt with and the evicted tenants put back, the result being that the number up to May last that had been restored was 1,033; and out of seventeen Plan of Campaign estates which were inquired into by the Evicted Tenants Commission of 1893 practically all have been settled but two. One would think that after the Land Conference, and after the Act of 1903, things were progressing most favourably. The only two estates that have not been dealt with are the Clanricarde estate and the Lewis estate. As I am reminded, the Lewis estate is only a question of price; they have offered to sell it. But the present Government wanted to hasten matters very much, and special regulations were made and extra inspectors were appointed to inquire into, and I may say search for, evicted tenants. Now, the number of applications is nothing short of enormous, because they have now reached the total of 8,401. For be it remembered that the total number of evicted tenants, including the Plan of Campaign estates tenants, inquired into by the Evicted Tenants Commission of 1893, was at 23rd February, 3,639. The truth of the matter is that it is not at all a bad business under the present circumstances, and with the present Government in power, to be an evicted tenant, or to make out that you are one.

I do not want to go into what has been said, and the promises, or rather hints, thrown out from the opposite side. I want to deal with exactly what is in the Bill. What does the Bill do? It takes land compulsorily from the owner, and that owner has no redress and no appeal. The Commissioners can decide the amount of land to be taken, and the situation of that land; they can evict the men who have been paying the rent of that land, and put in their place other men who formerly did not pay such rent. They can do all this absolutely, and there is no appeal of any sort or kind in the Bill, except to the Commissioners themselves. These Commissioners, I must submit, are a trinity in unity; they form their own appeal court, and they are unassailable and impregnable. There is a comic side, I think, as well as a serious one to it. The whole thing reminds me of the proceedings of Alice in Wonderland, where the Queen stalks about saying to everybody, "Off with his head, off with his head!" That is exactly what can be done under this Bill as regards the power of the Commissioners.

If there is to be compulsion under this Bill, it is certain that this House will agree that there must be an appeal from the Commissioners—an appeal on law and fact, including the question of the necessity of putting the Act in force. If the owner is willing to reinstate, surely compulsion is not necessary, but it might be put in force in order to drive a very hard bargain. I do not believe there is a necessity for compulsion, for if the Act of 1903 is worked properly, and sufficient financial assistance is given to that Act, the evicted tenants can be dealt with as they have been dealt with before. But if Parliament sanctions compulsion, it must be carried out after due inquiry on the subject, and in the most public manner, and not, as proposed in this Bill, by three gentlemen who are responsible to no one, and who are constituted into a court such as has never been known before, as the noble and learned Lord said, in the whole of the British Empire.

The Government propose to reinstate 2,000 tenants, and they are each to have 40 acres. This will take about 80,000 acres. By Paragraph 40 in their Report, the Estates Commissioners said that they have got already 80,000 acres of land. I know this has been said before, but I should like to impress it again upon the House. That land is not to be used for evicted tenants; it is to be used for improving the holdings which are supposed not to be economic, and therefore it shows pretty well what this Bill will do. They can take any amount of land for whatever purposes they like. I should like to know where the money is to come from to do all this, because they propose also that they should equip the farms, and stock them, and put up buildings. Besides this, as far as I can understand, there is nothing to prevent the Commissioners from dealing with the 8,401 so-called evicted tenants who have sent in applications. Pressure may be brought to bear upon those Commissioners which would be very hard to resist, and I cannot see how they could stop. And therefore, I think it is most essential that there should be some limit put in the Bill—either 2,000, or perhaps a little limit beyond that.

Now as to the dispossession of the so-called planters. It is interesting to note what Mr. John Redmond, the Leader of the Nationalist Party, said on that very subject, when the 1903 Bill was being debated, and I should just like, if your Lordships will allow me, to read that sentence. He said—

> "that there was no intention to put into the Bill (that is, the 1903 Bill) any provision by which pressure, direct or indirect, could be brought to bear on existing tenants; that the number of these new tenants who were really *bona fide* agriculturists was comparatively few, and that if they desired to continue in their holdings he would not give his sanction to any attempt compulsorily to put them out."

Evidently the learned Gentleman has changed his opinions, and I am afraid that these sayings can only be accounted as political pie-crust prepared and baked for the occasion. But it is interesting to note them, and I quote them for the benefit of noble Lords who do not live in Ireland and who now understand the sort of changes and opinions and promises that we have to put up with. It is utterly unfair and unjust, I say, to dispossess of his holding a man who has been farming properly and paying his way. I think the noble Lord in charge of the Bill said that if he is a farmer and farmed properly, his claim should be considered. I am very glad we have got that concession from him, and I only hope that when an Amendment is put forward in those terms he will agree to it.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I do not think those are the precise words I used.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: They were perhaps what the noble Lord meant.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I think that those are not the words I used.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: I took them down as well as I could. Now I pass from this to the Commissioners themselves, and their altered position under this Bill. In the 1903 Act, their *status* was most clearly defined; their actions could be criticised and debated by Parliament. What has happened under this Bill? You have made them Judges, and there also still remains the power—because it has not been repealed

—of the Lord-Lieutenant to make regulations with regard to those Commissioners. The Lord-Lieutenant cannot make regulations with regard to Judges any more than he can make regulations with regard to the Lord Chancellor who is sitting on the Woolsack; therefore, I say, and many of us will agree, that having put in the Bill that they are Judges, you remove them from all Parliamentary criticism and from all power of the Lord-Lieutenant to deal with them by regulations. If there was one thing that was fought over by the Unionist and Nationalist Parties in the House of Commons in the 1903 Bill, it was the *status* of the Commissioners—the power to criticise their actions, to bring what they did before Parliament, and to deal with the matter in the most open and free manner; how on earth can noble Lords get up and say that their *status* is not altered and that this is only put in to secure their tenure, when the words used are "County Court Judge"? Under Section 13, it is provided that—

> "The Estates Commissioners shall hold office by the same tenure as if they were County Court Judges in Ireland."

That is plain English, and we object most strongly to that *status* being altered. I never heard any complaint on the score of the Commissioners as to their tenure. I never heard them complain that their present teuure of office was not perfectly secure, and therefore I cannot see why this was done. The real truth is that it is to remove them from the power of criticism in Parliament, and to give them those autocratic powers which exist under the Bill.

Now I pass to the powers given under Clause 5 to enable them to fall back on the Land Purchase Aid Fund when they incur a loss on re-selling. That was dealt with fully by Lord Dunraven, and I fully concur in what he said about that. If there was one thing embodied in the 1903 Act it was that this Land Purchase Aid Fund was a golden bridge which was to make up the difference between the price given by the tenant and the price which the landlord was to receive; therefore I consider it is breaking a pledge to interfere in any way with this. I was glad to see that the noble Lord, the Lord President of the Council, suggested that the sum might be limited to about £100,000. I should like to see something of that sort put into the Bill. But it is not in the Bill now, and I hope that when the matter is brought forward we shall not be told that we are encroaching upon the privileges of the House of Commons. Once you begin to encroach upon that fund, there will be no end to it; it will be only a premium to the Commissioners to buy land here, there, and everywhere, and deal with it as they like —to buy dear and sell cheap—when they feel they have this bonus to fall back upon.

There is another question I should like to deal with, and that is the limit of the evicted tenants. There was a point raised by Lord Denman in regard to this Bill not being meant for returned sons of tenants, or returned tenants, from America. I have got a case on my own property. I have only got one evicted tenant on my property; it is a matter of years and years ago, but the Commissioners proposed to put back the son of a man who was returned from America, who was lately come back when he saw a chance of getting on a farm. He has been working on the railway and they were prepared to put him back. I do not myself object to his coming back, but as for the noble Lord saying that the Bill is not intended for that purpose, there is a case in point, where this man, the son of an evicted tenant, has come back from America specially to get back into the farm.

Now, my Lords, I have indicated, I think, the points to which Amendments will be directed. I admit that the evicted tenants question in Ireland is a source of constant trouble, and I admit the fact of its being mentioned in the Land Conference. It was essential to that Report that a good understanding should be arrived at; but having admitted so much, I cannot agree with His Majesty's Government that compulsion should be applied indiscriminately by a Commission of three without a vestige of appeal, and that further evictions should take place. That seems to me to be a complete reversal of the policy of the 1903 Act, which the present Government have declared they are ready to carry out to the best of their ability.

LORD HEMPHILL: My Lords, I should not intrude any opinion upon your Lordships' House in this protracted debate were it not that I happen to be an Irishman sitting on the Ministerial side of the House, and that I think I may fairly say that I have had a longer experience of Ireland in its various phases and forms than almost any—I may perhaps say than any—of the noble Lords whom I have the houour of addressing. Speaking with such experience, I accept this Bill as a means of healing a sore which, to my knowledge, for the last twenty-five years has defeated the objects of every successive Government in producing peace and goodwill in Ireland. I was struck with the speeches of the noble Marquess on the Front Bench and of my noble and learned friend Lord Atkinson, because those speeches, if they really were intended to affect the judgment of your Lordships' House, would have gone to reject this Bill altogether; and they were speeches which made it, as it appeared to me, almost inconsistent for either of those noble Lords to support the Second Reading of the Bill. But I can very well understand how that came about; because we all know that the cause of the evicted tenants was one of the levers by which the late Government was enabled to carry the Land Purchase Act of 1903 through the House of Commons; and this very provision about the evicted tenants was the sop thrown out to the Nationalists in the House of Commons on the one hand, and a bonus of £12,000,000 was the sop thrown out to the landlords on the other hand, by means of which that Bill became law—a most beneficial Bill, and a Bill which, with this necessary corollary—for I say the present Bill is a necessary corollary to the Bill of 1903—crowned the efforts of Mr. Gladstone, who redeemed Ireland, by his Land Court, from being—as it now would have been indeed—a land of desolation. Landlords and tenants alike would, I believe, have ceased to exist in Ireland, and the whole of the country would have been a perfect pandemonium. I have no hesitation in saying that, for I am old enough to remember the variety of movements which existed in Ireland. I have as a child heard of the Tithe War; I have heard of the various agrarian disturbances which decimated the country; and from the year 1870 down, a new era arose, and that new era was crowned by the Bill of 1903, followed by this measure which your Lordships are now considering.

I am not going to trouble your Lordships with any quotations, but I cannot resist making one exception as demonstrating the necessity, I might also say, for many noble Lords on the Opposition side of the House to consent to the Second Reading of this Bill. Mr. Wyndham, in Committee, used these words, which your Lordships will find in *Hansard*, Vol. CXXIV.—

> "They could not pick out here and there those who were misguided, others who had been fraudulent, or others who had been misled. If they did, they would be raking up the past. They must not look beyond this: that it was desirable, if they could, to give these men another chance."

That is to say, the evicted tenants—no matter why evicted, or from what circumstances their eviction came about—that it was desirable to give these men another chance. It was by observations such as that that the Bill was got through; and, in another place, in answer to a question of one of the Irish Members, Mr. Wyndham says—

> "The words 'evicted tenant' are not in the Bill; the class of persons referred to" (that is evicted tenants) "is covered by the provisions of Clause 2 (1) Sub-section (*d*)."

Therefore, it is as clear as that I am now addressing your Lordships that it was part of the compact by which that Bill became law that evicted tenants should be restored, no matter what had led to their eviction. There was only one limit, and that limit exists, and is not interfered with, namely, that they should have been evicted within twenty-five years before the passing of that Act. We know from the Report which has been so constantly referred to, that according to that Act, a great number—nearly 1,000—of the evicted tenants have been restored, because the owners of the land from which they were evicted have come to terms with the Land Commission; and even in the case of what were called the Plan of Campaign estates, which led to the phrase "the wounded soldiers of the war," applying that phrase to the evicted tenants, out of seventeen estates recapitulated in that Report, all, except two, namely the tenants of the noble Marquess who addressed the House from the Opposition Benches (The Marquess of Clanricarde) and those of Mr. Lewis have been reinstated.

It is said, why is not a limit mentioned in the present Bill ? There could not be a limit, because until it is ascertained what men have been evicted who are now seeking to be reinstated and who come within the condition of having been put out of their holdings within twenty-five years, it is impossible, without doing serious injustice, to put a limit of, say, 2,000 or any other number. But we know, as a matter of fact from the Report that 2,000 will more than cover those who will probably seek to be restored. After all, it is really a very small Bill; and knowing what I do about Ireland, having had some experience of the north and having represented a northern county for many years in the House of Commons, having been born, and lived the early part of my life, in the south, and having had opportunities of going through almost every county in Ireland, and knowing more or less what was going on between landlord and tenant, I am astonished at this stage that those who are interested in the great question of the land ownership of Ireland should offer any opposition to this which, I say, is in substance but a paltry Bill.

The great objection, and the main objection which has been put forward with so much force and energy by some of the speakers, has been with regard to the tribunal. Was there ever such an ill-founded objection as that ? What is the tribunal ? It consists of three gentlemen. Who are the gentlemen ? Men selected and appointed by the late Government, and one of those men a member of the Privy Council in Ireland, a man who had been for years one of the most extensive land agents in Ireland, and an Englishman by birth. That is one of the three. Who are the others ? Another is a barrister who was not particularly connected with land, not a partisan of either landlord or tenant, or, from his antecedents, likely to be so—Mr. Bailey who, for fifteen years, being appointed by the late Government, has acted more or less in connection with administering the Land Acts of 1903 and the antecedent Acts; and the third is a gentleman who, an Irishman by birth, passed, as I understand, the greater portion of his time in India, and who cannot have any leaning one way or the other. Why should not they be a fair tribunal *prima facie ?* What better tribunal would you substitute ? It is said, and the noble Lord who spoke last (The Earl of Mayo) dwelt very much on the fact, that they are to be put into the position of Judges. It is not exactly Judges—they are to be in the position of County Court Judges, who are removable by the Lord-Lieutenant by an order of the Privy Council on the certificate of the Lord Chancellor.

*Lord ASHBOURNE : Not in Ireland, save in the case of incapacity.

Lord HEMPHILL : I am speaking of Ireland. I think my noble and learned friend will find that I am right. That was the tenure of the County Court Judges. Of course we know that the Judges of the High Court are only removable by an Address of both Houses of Parliament to the Crown. However, I will not discuss the matter, as it is not very material. But at all events the reason of that is plain, and if it were not in the Bill, I could understand noble Lords opposite insisting upon it being put into the Bill. What was the object of making the Judges of the High Court independent ? One of the very great charters of English liberty and English law was making the Judges independent of the Crown. This was followed in Ireland in 1792 by one of the great movements which have brought about the partial regeneration of Ireland; and this is merely carrying out the same idea, that as you are giving these men power over the property of others, you should make them independent of a popular breeze, so that they should not be subject to the alterations of Government, or to the apprehension that, being appointed by the Tories, when the Liberals came in, they might be displaced. That is the real object of the measure; and, as I have said, if that were not in the Bill, I have not the slightest doubt that my noble and learned friend, if I may so call him, who never lets any point pass, would make it one of his strongest objections to the present measure. If it is insisted upon that there should be an appeal, there may be analogies for appeals. Under the Railways (Ireland) Act, when land is sought to be taken by a railway there is an appeal which is tried by a Judge and jury. Would the landlords like to have the value of their land tried by a jury? Certainly not, if I know anything of landlords, by a common jury in Ireland, although they may, under procedure, have a special jury. That may be a matter for amendment; and if that was proposed by noble Lords opposite it is quite possible that my friends on the front Ministerial Bench would not very seriously object. But of course I am not in a position to answer in any way for that. This idea about objecting to there being no appeal is merely to fasten upon some point upon which to criticise a Bill which after all is only carrying out a measure to which on every principle of justice and honour the Opposition as well as the Ministry are bound to give effect. It has been stated by one of the members of the Conference, the noble Lord who last spoke—and this is a matter of history and well-known by other noble Lords—that the Land Conference, which was the basis of the Bill of 1903, was based upon the idea that these wounded soldiers of the war, as they have been called, should be reinstated, and recollect that they cannot be reinstated unless they were evicted within twenty-five years; and also it has been stated as an objection (I was astonished when I heard it) that, forsooth, there is a provision that the creditors of the men who were evicted could not come down upon the farms after they were reinstated. If that were not so, it would be a nugatory measure, because these unfortunate men may have incurred debts and liabilities, and you would only be doing this through the medium of this Act of Parliament—you would be benefiting not the evicted tenants but their creditors. That is not the policy of the Bill. Any debts contracted since 1st May, I think it is, in the present year, will attach to the land when it is restored to the existing tenants; but old debts of course will not have any operation. If they had, the Act would be nugatory. I will not further detain your Lordships. I have only touched upon some general topics; but I felt that I should not be doing my duty, I might say, to my country if I did not express my astonishment that so much heat has been thrown into this debate with reference to a Bill which as a matter of fact is a very small act of justice to a very distressful country.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, before I venture to say a very few words with reference to what has passed since we commenced discussing this subject at about five o'clock, I want to take the first opportunity that I have in addressing your Lordships upon this subject of entering my strongest possible protest and denial against something that was said last Friday, I think it was—when this Bill was read a third time in the House of Commons—by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Mr. Birrell suggested that the Act of 1903 had put money into the landlords' pockets, and that was a ground upon which he should ask the landlords to throw themselves into this undertaking. Mr. Birrell seems unable to forget that he was at one time responsible for the political publications of the Party opposite, and he does not seem to have been able to resist, on Friday last, something which instinct probably taught him might at some future date be useful at elections. I wish to enter my strongest possible protest against the suggestion made. It is not true that any of us are going to have money put into our pockets by the Act of 1903. Some of us hope some day to be able to save what we have got if we can sell under the Act, but I do not know of a single case of any landlord who is likely to make any profit—or in other words, to have money put into his pocket—as the result of that Act. Therefore I protest against this attempt almost to suggest that we should consider ourselves to have been bribed into giving support to the scheme outlined in this Bill.

There are two things which I think irresistibly strike one in contemplation of the debate that we have had this evening: First, one cannot help being struck by the extraordinary enthusiasm with which the noble Earl opposite has been supported in presenting this Bill to your Lordships. The noble Earl finished his speech at a quarter to six. It was half-past nine before anyone rose on his side of the House to support the Bill. It was ten minutes past ten before the noble and learned Lord who has just sat down (Lord Hemphill)—that is to say before the first person not officially connected with the Government—rose to support the noble Earl. I can only say that I hope it will be a long time before the noble Earl again receives such wretched support from his Party when he makes a proposal to your Lordships.

What is the second thing which strikes one in connection with this debate? One is, I think, irresistibly struck with the thought that it is quite evident that His Majesty's Government have given no consideration whatever as to what will be the general results of the passing of this Bill in Ireland. For the first time, I think, this Bill establishes the principle that agitation pays, and that if you do not carry out your obligations, you are likely to get into a better position than if you had carried them out. The noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, drew attention to this point in his speech earlier in the evening, and I am not going to labour it, but it seems to me a most extraordinary position that you are going to set up. A right hon. friend of mine in another place has pointed out that His Majesty's Government are going to keep two tribunals going in Ireland. You are to have in future the Land Commission fixing fair rents, and you are to have the Estates Commission finding holdings for individuals who have failed to pay fair rents. Surely this can have nothing but a lamentable educational effect upon people in Ireland! It may even have a worse effect than that in this case from an English point of view. I cannot help wondering whether perhaps forty or fifty years hence, when the grandchildren of the tenants who are now buying land are getting a little tired of paying back to the English taxpayer the instalments upon their purchase—I cannot help wondering whether any old friend will be found to remind them of the happy days of 1907, when it paid to agitate—when it paid not to carry out your obligations—and to suggest that perhaps a little of the same treatment might be good for our grandchildren when they are sitting upon the benches of this House.

So much, my Lords, for the more distant effect that I am afraid this Bill may have. But what is going to be its immediate effect? You are going to set down men who are now planters in other parts of the country if you find them holdings. You are going to set down evicted tenants in other cases from other parts of the country, and they are to come in as strangers. It is not denied that in Ireland there is the greatest objection to what is known as migrating. It is not denied that there is the greatest objection in many localities to receiving migrants, and the evidence given before the Commission which has been so much referred to this evening goes to show that the objection is increasing rather than decreasing. I believe it is an open secret that a certain number of evicted tenants from the Clanricarde estates were found new holdings in the same county, but at some distance from their old holdings, and were taken to them last March, and that although they were shepherded by a representative of the Estates Commission, they rapidly came home, refusing to take the new holdings that had been found for them, under the influence of what has been called local opposition. It is quite possible that if this Bill works on a large scale you may have a great deal more cattle-driving and other sorts of intimidation against these planters and against evicted tenants whom you set up in new localities—and you will have parts of the country in as bad a state as parts of the country are in now if not worse. There will be this difference, of course. At present cattle-driving is aimed either at the landlord or at the planter, and His Majesty's Government do not consider it a very serious crime. I wonder if they will consider it a very serious crime when it is aimed against them and their *proteges*? I confess that if—what I should regret extremely—we find serious attacks organised against these migrants I shall have much pleasure in reminding my noble friend Lord Denman of a speech I have already commented upon several times, and which I am not going to rub in any further now.

The noble Lord, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, referred to what is known as the agreement of 1903. I cannot flatter myself that I ever expected to convert him to the view I expressed about the intention of the Act, and I hope he does not think that he has converted me. But I still maintain that it was the intention in 1903 that evicted tenants should be reinstated *pari passu* with the other provisions in the Bill, and I take my stand, in saying that, upon two main grounds. The first ground is that as soon as the Bill was passed, His Majesty's Government of the day issued a regulation to that effect, and I do not think that it can be maintained that they would have issued that regulation if it had not been understood at the time to be a part of the bargain. Secondly, I take my stand upon the actual words of the Act itself. These operations, as your Lordships are well aware, take place under Clause 2 of the Act, which (the words are perfectly plain and straightforward) states that in the case of the sale of an estate advances may be made for the purchase of parcels thereof for certain purposes, and the fourth of the purposes mentioned is with regard to evicted tenants. Surely the wording of that clause is perfectly straightforward. In the case of the sale of an estate, evicted tenants were to be restored, and they obviously were not considered particularly urgent, because they do not appear until subsection (*d*) of the clause; it is not even considered worth while to single them out for special treatment, they have to take their turn with tenants requiring enlarged holdings and so forth. That was the agreement as I remember it in 1903. That was the agreement also in the Bill, and I claim that it is the only agreement that binds anybody on either side. His Majesty's Government are departing from that agreement, and they are applying compulsion. I am anxious to see this question settled, and I do not object to compulsion myself nearly as much, perhaps, as several of my noble friends behind me. But I do not object to compulsion only upon the distinct understanding that the compulsion is to be exercised in a fair manner, and that there is some case for its exercise. No case as yet, I maintain, has been shown to us.

I do not believe that anybody in Ireland, and I am going to quote evidence from my opponents to show it, objects to selling untenanted land if he is sure of what the noble Lord on the Woolsack calls an honest price. But do not let us forget what an honest price is. I think that His Majesty's Government do not quite realise what the value of some of this grass land is to many owners —particularly not very large owners. I apologise for mentioning for one moment purely elementary facts, but every landlord's property (I am speaking now of the generality of landlords) divides itself into two classes. There is a certain amount of tenanted land, and a certain amount of untenanted land. But perhaps that is not quite a wide enough distinction. There is a certain amount of land to which the Act of 1881 applies, and there is a certain amount of land to which the Act of 1881 does not apply. In the case of land to which the Land Act of 1881 applies, all competition in fixing rent is eliminated. The Land Commission has reduced rents about an average of 40 per cent. since 1881. Why? None of us know. We used to think that the reason for reduction of rent—at least, the only logical reason I have ever heard put forward—was that the tenant right did not belong to the landlord; and therefore a reduction was made from what was obviously the commercial value of the land in fixing the rent. But, unfortunately, Mr. Bailey's evidence, quoted by Lord Atkinson, made it perfectly clear that the Land Commission never even had such a logical view as that on which to base its decisions, and that the whole thing was more or less a rule of thumb. But the fact remains that the rents have been reduced 40 per cent.; and that has had this result: I fancy if you analyse a certain number of average-sized properties in Ireland owned by a landlord, you will find that the rents he receives from his tenanted land, that is to say, rents fixed by the Land Commission, do very little more than pay his legal outgoings upon that land, and in those I include head-rents, Crown rents, quit-rents, land improvement charges, family charges, and so forth. He has practically no income at all of his own from tenanted land, because whereas rents have been reduced, the head-rents and those other items I have mentioned have not been reduced. Doubtless you will be able to quote some cases of big landlords to whom this does not apply; but I am speaking of the average landlord in the South of Ireland as I know him. What remains to him as his personal income? There remains only his income from his untenanted and grazing lands, where competition remains. These latter rents are fixed by competition in the open market. They provide the owner with practically all the income he receives, and which enables him to live at home and keep up his place. Some of it is the finest fattening land in Europe, I might almost say; and, Canadian cattle or no Canadian cattle, it is not unreasonable, we think, that we should be very chary of parting with this land, except at the honest price which we hope this Bill when we have done amending it is going to secure us. After all, that is the basis on which all arbitrations have taken place hitherto, arbitrations resulting from the compulsory purchase of land—that is, the honest price, the price that secures the present income. And, though I acknowledge at once that the noble Lord upon the Woolsack has promised us an honest price, there is no machinery in the Bill that makes it likely that we shall get anything of the kind.

Now, my Lords, one word as to the necessity for compulsion. My noble friend beside me (Lord Dunraven) told us that it was necessary. He did not actually quote any case to prove it, but I think he went a good deal further than Government speakers are accustomed to go in dealing with this point—although of course I am not classing Lord Dunraven as a Government speaker. The noble Earl who moved the Second Reading of the Bill treated it very gingerly indeed, I thought. I should have been much better pleased if he had gone into the question of compulsion, and the necessity for compulsion, a great deal more deeply than he did. But I am not surprised that he did not, because we have a tremendous amount of evidence upon that subject, evidence which is up-to-date and which points all the other way. I lay it down as a general proposition, and I should be greatly interested if it can be contradicted, that wherever an honest price has been offered there has been no case of failure to purchase. There is plenty of evidence from various departments on this point. I make no excuse even at this hour for quoting some of this evidence at length, for this point is very important. The noble Lord opposite, Lord Denman, objected a little hardly that Lord Atkinson had been inclined to pick out evidence and draw conclusions from that. I am going to read one or two extracts, and I promise him I am not going to leave anything out. I think it well to quote several instances on this point, because the subject is one of very great importance, and it is so frequently avoided by Government speakers. The witnesses all appeared before Lord Dudley's Commission. I will first quote the evidence of Mr. Doran, Chief Land Inspector of the Congested Districts Board in September, 1906. In answer to Question 2,628 he says—

> "They have opened negotiations with very few persons they had not dealt with."

Question 2,633—

> "They had never got a blank refusal."

By Question 2,636, he is asked—

> "In fact in every case of failure to come to terms it is because they have asked a price you could not offer?—Yes."

The next witness is Mr. Commissioner Wrench. His evidence was given on 5th and 6th November, 1906, and he wrote a memorandum in 1898 and brought it up to date by his comments. Question 14,468—

> "Many owners of tenanted lands and also of grazing lands in or near the congested districts would be inclined to sell if they felt that they would be fairly treated?—My idea is that if men knew they would get a fair equivalent for the land they had to sell, then a lot of men

would offer their grass lands. I think that has been borne out by what has happened since."

Question 15,047—

"I believe by fair treatment you can arrive at what you want without compulsion."

Question 15,080—

"I say the first thing is to offer the vendor the equivalent of his net income, and, if that fails, it will be time enough to resort to compulsion."

There has been no attempt to prove that this attempt suggested by Mr. Wrench has ever been made, and, of course, there has been no attempt to prove that it has failed. Why has not Mr. Wrench's suggestion been followed? Why is it that compulsion is necessary in the opinion of the Government? I do not think it has been referred to yet in the course of the debate, but I think the answer is to be found in another answer given by Mr. Wrench close by the extracts I have just read. At Question 14,951, he says—

"I do not believe that if you did approach these people and tell them you would give them an equivalent income, they could refuse, but you must remember this, that the Estates Commissioners have no power to take this course. Of course our valuers, when they come to look at land of this class, see to what account it can be turned and see at what price it can be relet in smaller holdings. They cannot put a price on it which we cannot recover, and, therefore a landlord or owner may have land that is more valuable in its present position than it would be when it is sold to us and cut up into the small holdings which we want to create."

We therefore have this position. The land is worth more to the landlord than it is to the Commissioners. This Bill consequently is brought in to enable the Estates Commissioners to force down the price which they may feel justified in giving. We are grateful, as I have said before, to the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack for promising us an honest price. I say it with the greatest regret, but I believe if an honest price was intended, the machinery of the Bill is absolutely unnecessary. The sole necessity for this Bill lies in the need which the Estate Commissioners have to force down prices. In fact, the Estates Commissioners are setting up a system of bearing that is enough to make the mouth of a member of the Stock Exchange water. This is proved further by other passages in the evidence, from our own experience, and from the circumstances of the case.

I would remind your Lordships again of the difference between tenanted and untenanted land. There are two interests in all land. There is the owner's interest, and there is the tenant's interest. In untenanted land both are there, but they are concentrated in the owner. We claim, and we always have claimed, that the owner should be compensated for both when untenanted land is taken from him. He very often has to pay a high price for what is technically known as the tenant's right, and on what principle of justice he should not be compensated for this when the land is taken from him I am personally unable to guess. The fact remains that one of the Estate Commissioners, Mr. Finucane, who has already been referred to, has absolutely scouted the idea that any owner has the right to compensation for any tenant right whatever. The noble Lord will find that on page 326 in the note made in the Appendix of Vol. 3, in which Mr. Finucane's evidence appears. I think therefore we are not unreasonable in claiming, knowing the facts of the case as we do, that any man who denies to us the right we have in the tenant's right in the land that is on our hands is not the person who should be asked to arbitrate the price at which the land is to be taken from us compulsorily.

The noble Lord opposite, Lord Hemphill, recited, and recited perfectly correctly, the qualifications and characters of the three Estates Commissioners. The last thing that I desire to do is to attack their qualifications or their character, but I do attack what they have said, and I say, in view of what they have said, they are not the right people to arbitrate the price at which our land is to be taken from us. But more than that; I say in no case whatever is the purchaser the right person to fix a price when the land is taken compulsorily. The noble Earl who introduced the Bill made no attempt to attack that general proposition. He himself is the owner of some of the most beautiful and valuable property in the whole of England. Would he himself consent under any condition whatever to allow that property to be referred to in a Bill and to be scheduled subject to the fact that the purchaser, who might be one of his colleagues on the Front Bench, was to have the right of deciding whether he would purchase that property or not and how much he would pay for it when he did? That is exactly the position the noble Earl is putting us in when he seeks to subject us to the conditions of this Bill as introduced. We do not object to, and nobody is dreaming of attacking, the personal qualifications or characters of the Estates Commissioners; but we say, on a general principle, it is unheard of that the purchaser should fix the price and be arbitrator on countless other questions which are bound to arise in the course of the administration of this Bill.

I was maintaining that the object of this Bill is not to make it possible for the Estates Commissioners to get the land, but in order to enable the Government to force down the price. I quote, secondly, the case of the Lewis Estate. It is obvious from the experience in that case that the thing fell through, not through any unwillingness on the part of the owner, but because the Government would not pay the honest price for the land they desired. Lastly, I referred to the circumstances of the case. I desire to point out that my case has been admitted by one of the Estates Commissioners. Mr. Commissioner Wrench, in answer to Question 15143, stated:—

> "If the valuation of such land is left to the officials of the Estate Commissioners or the Congested Districts Board, they would naturally be tempted to discount the price for the land below its value to the owner in its present condition, so as to minimise the total loss on resale."

There is a direct statement of one of the Estates Commissioners that his Department is not the right person to to fix the price without subsequent appeal. Do not forget another point in the circumstances of the case. After all, who are the Estates Commissioners? Like all Government Departments they are subject to the control of the Treasury. I cannot imagine that they are going to be allowed to hand out public money without the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury being fully consulted. Anyone who has had anything to do with the Treasury knows it has very little soul and no charity. We cannot conceive the Treasury, being given powers as they will get indirectly under this Bill to pay a low price for a thing, not exercising these powers. In every case where they can get £1 off, there will be plenty of pressure brought to bear in the Estates Commissioners to get it off. The idea is ludicrous from the point of view of the vendor, and yet it is part of the working of the scheme proposed.

It is late, and I of course acquiesce in the suggestion that the Bill is to be read a second time. But we are making our protest on this occasion as we shall do later when this Bill gets into Committee. We are only a small minority in Ireland, of course, and we know that Mr Birrell holds strong views to the effect that minorities must suffer —in fact, I think he is never so happy as when he sees that minorities do suffer, or is giving them an opportunity to suffer— but I hope there will be no doubt in your Lordships' minds that it is quite impossible to pass this Bill in the form it has reached your Lordships, and I sincerely hope your Lordships will support the view of my noble friends from Ireland when they come to move their Amendments.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): I am sorry to intervene in this debate, but I do so for one main reason. I think the Bill has been justified, because after all the result of this debate is that it ought to be read a second time and go into Committee. I do not understand that any of your Lordships take a different view. I would rather not have spoken for the Bill at all, because so far as it deals with the law it is not law with which I profess to be very familiar. The Statute law is of a very complicated character, and so far as it deals with facts I have not had the advantage I wish I had had of seeing the conditions in Ireland. I am afraid any facts that I might introduce would probably be erroneous. It is quite clear, however, that you must not expect an ordinary Bill to deal with this subject. The Bill is one to stay agrarian strife and to clear up abnormal difficulties which have arisen. All you can require is that the methods should be just, and that I think you are doing. Everyone I have heard in this debate agrees that there ought to be a reinstatement of these evicted tenants. It is quite true that the noble Earl who has just sat down said the Bill showed that it paid to be dishonest and not pay your rent. If that is so, then the Land Act of 1903 also showed it, because it, too, provided for the restoration, although not compulsorily, of the evicted tenants. The truth is, people are willing to let bygones be bygones and to try and heal the wounds. That, I understand, was the spirit which dictated the provision of the Act of 1903, and that and nothing else dictates the spirit of the proposal to-day. Therefore we are all agreed that these men are to be reinstated. The noble Earl spoke very strongly about compulsion not being necessary. Does he wish to exclude compulsion from this Bill? He will not say so. The noble Earl, Lord Mayo, does not wish it. He said quite frankly he thought there ought to be compulsion.

THE EARL OF MAYO: With justice.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: With justice: justice is the necessary concomitant of any proposal. Very well, then, there ought to be compulsion. Under those circumstances the only question is as to what are the terms, and that, I venture to think, is a matter entirely for Committee. It is not that I wish to avoid or shirk for a moment any one of these questions. We are quite prepared to meet them, but your Lordships must have observed in the course of the debate that there is a practical difficulty in dealing with different points on a Second Reading stage, because they all get mixed up one with another, and those points which are good lose by confusion with other points. It is difficult to get a clear issue with regard to any of the numerous points. I do not believe anyone who had listened to this debate can have failed to have seen that it is a signal illustration of what I have said. In other words, these things really ought to go to the Committee.

I have put down in pencil, and will devote one sentence to each of the different points referred to. "Are *bona fide* farmers to be turned out?" That is not the purpose of the Bill at all. If you want to put words in, let us wait and see what they are. "Are purchasing tenants to be removed?" I was under the same impression myself as Lord Denman that, by reason of the Purchase Acts being included in this Bill, it could not be done—that purchasing tenants could not be extruded. If Lord Ashbourne thinks otherwise, who am I to stand before him?

LORD ASHBOURNE: The Chief Secretary in the other House stated, in reference to this point, that it would be a matter for the discretion of the Estates Commissioners what they would do, and he had no doubt they would not disturb the tenant purchaser.

THE EARL OF CREWE: That is not so.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The noble Lord is a great authority on this point, and, if he says I am wrong, I will not say any more. "Are honest prices to be paid?" I have been rightly reminded of what I thought was an elementary truism when I said that honest prices ought to be paid. Of course, I think they ought to be paid. "Is there to be an appeal, and are there to be limits to the Bill?" Let us see any proposals that are made, and we will give them perfectly fair consideration.

The only other point that really remains is whether the Estates Commissioners are trustworthy or proper persons to be entrusted with these duties. May I say this: I think the House will generally agree that it is a very distressing thing that men's capacity and character—for after all, there were reflections on the Estates Commissioners in regard to their impartiality and honesty, which are very dear to anybody—should be spoken of in a hostile spirit when they are not able to be here to answer for themselves. I always have a strong feeling about that, and I think we ought in Parliament to be particularly careful. I have a great respect for my noble friend Lord Atkinson, but I think, if he had reflected, he would perhaps have refrained from saying something he did say. I was glad to hear Lord Donoughmore speak of these gentlemen as worthy of respect for their straightforwardness. The other evening Lord Mayo said substantially the same thing. You may say they ought not to be the right persons to judge. We will discuss that. You may say that they are not, and we will see how the matter stands. But do not let this debate end with a sort of aspersion cast upon the character and honesty of gentlemen who, I believe, are thoroughly entitled to our respect.

Under these circumstances I think I have really said everything that I want to say. This Bill is a Bill which, according to the general consensus of opinion, ought to go to Second Reading. I think behind it there is even more. Lord Lansdowne warned your Lordships—he gave reasons for which the Bill should be read a second time—that it might produce serious results if the Bill were not passed into law. I understood him so to say. He is a statesman of great experience, and from all I know—not professing to have any special knowledge beyond that of a Member of the Government—I believe that is absolutely true, and I sincerely trust that your Lordships will not use the numerical power you have for the purpose of defeating in Committee or otherwise a Bill which I believe, and which the Government believe, to be necessary for the peace, order, and good government of Ireland.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: I do not think even the reassuring words of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack will convince the Members on this side of the House that full justice has been done to the feelings of the Opposition in this House, and of a large body of opinion in the country, as to the merits of the Bill. The noble and learned Lord has spoken as if we were all agreed upon the principles, and as if there were only a few details which required explanation in Committee. I think it should be made perfectly clear at the close of this long discussion, as it was at the beginning by the noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, that we are not agreed upon the principle of the Bill, that we do not admit it is a good or a wise principle, the principle of compulsion, and that we assent to the Second Reading solely on the ground of a patriotic desire not to incur in Ireland difficulties which the noble Lords opposite have declared to be imminent, and with regard to which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has just addressed to us a solemn warning. I would go further and say that if there is so small a measure of divergence between us as the noble and learned Lord leads us to believe, I welcome the statement, and I hope to see the opinion put into actual words and terms when we come into Committee on the Bill. Anything more divergent than the views expressed and the explanations given by the Members of the Government from the actual wording of the Bill has never, I venture to say, been heard within the walls of Parliament.

I speak with some recollection and experience of previous Bills on this subject. I had not the honour of being in Parliament, I am glad to say, because I was not of age at the time, when the Act of 1870 was passed, but I have been present at every discussion in the House of Commons on every Land Act since that Act, beginning with 1881, and I would appeal to my noble and learned friend behind me whether throughout the Act of 1881 we did not have assurance of the firm convictions of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues that the objects of the Bill were the determination of fair rents, from which all sorts of advantages were to follow, and that any general revision of or interference with rents in Ireland was not to be expected. That genuine opinion turned out to be wholly at variance with what occurred.

To-night I would trouble your Lordships for a few moments in order to point out that what there is in the Bill has not been substantiated by the speeches we have heard from the other side of the House. Take the question of appeal. It is perfectly true Lord Denman uttered an encomium on the Estates Commissioners, which, if it stood alone, would lead us to believe that the Government did not intend to give us anything in the nature of an appeal; but there was the speech of the noble Earl who introduced the Bill, and also the speech of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack who spoke repeatedly of justice, and who pointedly avoided making any reference to those parts of my noble friend Lord Atkinson's speech in which he pointed out that there was not, not only in the United Kingdom, but in any part of the British Empire, any statute by which those who were a party to a suit were allowed to be the judges, and the uncontrolled judges, of the amount to be paid. Are we to have an appeal, or are we not? I believe from the language used to-night that such an appeal will receive something more than what the Lord President said—the earnest consideration of the Government. If we are to have this appeal, how comes it that when the Bill comes up to this House after discussion in the Commons we have not got a word in it to mitigate the asperity of the provision which leaves the whole land of Ireland at the mercy of the Estates Commissioners?

Then again comes the removal of the sitting tenant—the planter. I would say this just in passing. I am not going to reiterate arguments put by those who have previously spoken. This Bill goes back on the teaching of all Irish Land Acts, beginning with 1870. A feature of all those Acts has been respect for the sitting tenant, and the effect of that has been to make it difficult for any landlord or all the landlords in Ireland together to resume possession of a single hundred acres of land for any purpose whatever, unless it be by the volition of the tenant or by reason of the non-payment of rent. It is assumed in this Bill that, whereas it is difficult, be the desire what you may, to resume possession of a hundred acres of land, 80,000 acres are going to be obtained without in any way prejudicing existing conditions of peace or prosperity in any county and without pressing hardly on any sitting tenant or landlord. There again, the language of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack would lead us to believe that proper and reasonable safeguards will be accepted, but I again ask is it not extraordinary that a Bill which is supposed to have run the racket in another place should come before us without any safeguard whatever against our fear that for every tenant you put back you will make another man suffer? I say in that case the detail of the Bill is the principle of the Bill, and I submit that the power we are asked to sanction and to put into the hands of the Estates Commissioners is one which will not lead to peace or order in Ireland and will only cause further measures to become necessary at no very distant date.

Then, again, the language of the Chief Secretary the other night was most satisfactory with regard to the extent to which the Bill was to be used. He said it was to be used cautiously and warily. He said compulsion was to be rare, and he added a rather ominous reference to one or two cases where it was desirable in the interests of the law and order of a neighbourhood that a man should go. One or two cases, my Lords. These cases will have rather a tendency to multiply themselves when it becomes known to the population in various localities that it such cases are established they will be made to go.

I remember perfectly when I was at Oxford an unfortunate undergraduate who has now a seat in your Lordships' House had been subjected to some of the discipline we hear of in cavalry regiments occasionally. He was a most inoffensive individual, but his windows were occasionally broken, and we were all struck when one day the head of his college sent for him and told him he must go. He asked what his offence was, and he was told that he was an element of disorder in the college. I was never satisfied quite of the justice of that incident, which I think the Under-Secretary for War may remember, although it does not refer to him personally. It certainly struck me very much with regard to Mr. Birrell's statement that because they were elements of disorder in their neighbourhood, although they might be inoffensive men, properly cultivating their holdings, they must go. I thought that was a *vice versa* reference.

Even the Chief Secretary is a highly advantageous witness when we come to compare his views with those of the Estates Commissioners. I will only trouble your Lordships with one quotation. If the spirit of the Chief Secretary is to animate the whole business, we might hope for something, but at the very last moment he put the Estates Commissioners outside his control by making them County Court Judges. I read Mr. Finucane's evidence at page 116 of the Blue-book. He said—

> "In counties where the deficiency cannot be made good by voluntary sales, demesnes, then farms of over £50 valuation instead of £100 may have to be made liable to diminution, or the people for whom farms cannot be found in their own counties may have to be migrated on to untenanted land in the nearest county in which it is available."

THE EARL OF CREWE: May I ask the noble Lord if that is in reference to evicted tenants or to the general question of uneconomic holdings? I ask for information.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: The quotation is as to Mr. Finucane's views as to what is desirable in the way of meeting the needs of the congested districts. I understand his view is that in administering these Acts it is desirable that you should decrease holdings so as to provide for those who have insufficient holdings. His view, therefore, certainly does not square with that of the Chief Secretary. It is thought that only in one or two cases it may be necessary to remove men and not make this general clearance which is part of the scheme of Mr. Finucane and his colleagues. I confess that the whole of what Mr. Finucane has proposed or suggested might be allowed to do is justified by the language of the Bill. To take that language and leave it where it is, would, I think, be equivalent to starting that revolution in Ireland which we all desire to avoid. If I were to use the extreme language which the noble Lord opposite, Lord Hemphill, applied to the Gladstonian Acts, I might say that this would be a case in which landlords and tenants would cease to exist and the whole country would become a pandemonium. I think that might be compared with the Arcadia which Mr. Finucane has suggested in which the country is to be studded with returned tenants who have got land at under cost price and are therefore to some extent the guests of the nation, amongst tenants who have paid their rents and therefore who have not got their land at under cost price, some 2,000 of whom will be removed to other locations and will have to carry on their business under police protection. I think, so long as the words of the Bill remain unamended, we are entitled to have great suspicion as to the effect of them.

I desire to say one word more with regard to the opinions of the Government. I notice a very great gradual change in those opinions during the passage of the Bill. I venture to say no man has been so largely educated in public opinion during the passage of a Bill as the Chief Secretary. The language used in his last speech was very different from that in which he told us some months ago that the people of Galway could not be long expected to acquiesce in the existence of these large grass farms which they desired to divide up. I should be the last to quarrel with the opinions of the Government, if, when we go into Committee, they are found to square with ours in this respect, but, before I sit down, I desire to point out that this Bill is not a Bill of progress. In every respect, except in the desire to benefit the evicted tenants and to pacify public opinion in Ireland, it is a retrograde measure. It unsettles much that has been before regarded as settled. Why is it that all these Bills, founded in hope and manned with public money, have been doomed to disappointment? It is because there has been no finality and because they have been supplanted by other measures. I am not saying that one Party is more to blame than another, but each Bill has been followed by something more favourable to the tenant farmers, and when the noble Earl who introduced the Bill said this was one more step in the tedious—or was it devious?—path of attempting to settle the Irish Land question, I could not help asking whether when we are willing to do what we can to close up the sore, it can be wise to open the door to all these fresh sores, to induce people to believe that the one protection, which was left to the landlord, the penalty for non-payment of rent, is to be disregarded and disregarded so that those who are put back are placed in a better position than those who had fulfilled all their liabilities.

Therefore, although we assent to the Second Reading of the Bill to-night, I think it should be understood that we do so with a perfectly clear understanding as to our own position. I am not going to trouble your Lordships at this hour with any questions which might be raised in Committee, as to the amount of money which will be requisite to put back these tenants, and whether that can be allowed to take precedence of the £20,000,000 of agreements which have already been allowed, and for which there is at present no Treasury provision; nor will I ask any question with regard to the important point whether a landlord who has on large farms bought the interest of the tenant, and is the owner of the tenants' interest as well as of the landlord's interest, is to receive any consideration. It is not found in the Bill at present. What I press upon the Government is this: we assent to the Second Reading with the clear intention of asking your Lordships in Committee to re-consider the tribunal which shall ultimately decide both as to law and as to fact, and also as to value. We are determined to introduce Amendments, and to press upon the Government Amendments which will take care that the sitting tenant, if he is genuinely cultivating his farm, is not injured. We are also clear that the agreements made under previous Acts must be respected, and must not be shoved aside for additional agreements, for which money may hastily be found to the detriment of the first agreements. We are not satisfied with statistics of the Commissioners as hastily changed after the closure had been applied in another place. We think that the Government, after the unique experience by which in their brief period of rule 800 evicted tenants have developed into 8,000, and the cost has risen from £250,000 to £2,500,000, must be given some protection against those who will press them again to extend the number of evicted tenants. If we do not succeed in doing that, we believe the unrest which exists in some parts of Ireland will be fostered and accentuated by the Bill. Holding these views, I have risen, after the soothing speech of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, to assure your Lordships that nothing will be wanting on our side to restrict the Amendments we will put forward to what will be just between the parties. The Amendments will not be directed to an attempt to wreck the Bill or to prevent reinstatement of the evicted tenants. We, however, consider that the several points I have named are absolutely vital to the Bill, to the good faith of Parliament, and to our reputation as a legislative assembly for justice.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): The noble Viscount who has just sat down tells us in strong and almost threatening language what the noble Lords opposite are going to do with this Bill in Committee. As I understand the noble Viscount, it is not intended to divide against the Second Reading of this Bill, but it is intended to oppose every one of its principal provisions when we get into Committee. We understand that game. We have had to deal with it before. I venture humbly to think it is not a good game for any Opposition to play. It would be much better that you should meet this Bill by moving that it should be read a second time this day three months. That would have been a perfectly straightforward method. I do not think the method you propose to pursue will reflect upon you all the honour which the noble Viscount seemed to think would result from it.

At this hour I do not propose to follow those who have preceded me into the details of this Bill. They can all be discussed and they will all be discussed in Committee. We have already been told to what extent that discussion will be carried, and we shall be prepared to meet it when the time comes. I think, after much of what has been said in this debate, it is my duty before the House adjourns to ask your Lordships to consider what is the position which the Government had to deal with in this matter. What is the position in which this question was left by those who preceded us in office? I confess I was greatly surprised by a good deal that fell from the noble Earl the Earl of Donoughmore. I remember very well the year 1903, and I remember the ability with which, from the back Benches on this side of the House, he discussed the Land Bill and made for himself that reputation which has led him to the seat he now occupies, and which will, I hope, only be the commencement of a distinguished public career. I was surprised when the noble Earl said that he did not think that the clause in the Land Act of 1903 which refers to the question with which we have to deal to-night gave any substantial security or pledge to the evicted tenants that they should be to any extent restored either to their ancient holdings or to equal holdings of another kind.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I do not want to interrupt the noble Marquess, but my point was that they were not to have a preference

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: They were not to have a preference? Then what were they to have? That is just what I want to know. I want to know from the authors and supporters of the Act of 1903 what they meant, because, after what had passed, that is exactly what I am unable to understand. I thought they meant a great deal. I thought they meant something very serious. It so happens that it was on the 6th August, exactly four years ago, and this is the language used by the Leader of the Opposition. He was, I think, following the speech of Lord Barrymore, and he said—

> "Surely if the noble Lord followed, as no doubt he did, the discussions which took place elsewhere, he must know that those provisions which contemplated the possibility of the restoration of the evicted tenants or their representatives in suitable cases to the holdings they once occupied was an essential element in the compromise, and that if the element had been excluded it was possible that the Bill might not at this moment be upon the Table of your Lordships' House."

What does that mean? It means that the provision for the evicted tenants was a provision in the nature of a compromise made in the House of Commons for the purpose of securing the passing of the Bill through the House. Stronger language could not be used, because my noble friend said that if the compromise had not been made the Bill would not have passed the House of Commons. It would not have come up to this House. Well, then, it was a compromise. It was an understanding, and my noble friend opposite does not deny it. It was an understanding by means of which the Bill came up to this House.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Might I point out that more evicted tenants have already been replaced than were then known to exist; so that at all events the late Government did their part?

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: Then the compromise was wholly illusory. If there were no evicted tenants to be restored, why talk about a compromise? What is the good of that? There was nothing to do. I cannot accept the explanation. The noble Lord could not have used the language he did employ unless he had meant to say that the provision affecting the interests of the evicted tenants was a real and substantial provision intended to place them in an advantageous position. I do not want to use too strong language upon the subject. That was the position which he took up. That was the provision contained in the Act of 1903. The singular part of the position we had to deal with was this; I think Lord Donoughmore said that very little after the Act was passed—I know it was not very long—the late Government put out regulations in which they altogether set aside for immediate practical purposes that provision; they refused the application for additional aid from the Estates Commissioners, and told them to deal with their other duties and leave that matter alone. That left to the new Government a position of no ordinary difficulty. We were forced, as we thought, to carry out the undertaking which had been made—the compromise which had been arranged by the Act of 1903. We took the matter into our consideration. We found that nothing had been done, and that, on the contrary, the Commissioners had been practically prohibited from taking any step up to that time. There was a growing feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction at what was naturally considered to be a breach of the compromise made. You have no right to say we have needlessly taken up the question. We have taken up the technical situation which you left, and we are endeavouring to deal with that situation and to do something which will satisfy the aspirations which you created. I observed, by the bye, that the noble Lord opposite, Lord Atkinson, told us not to hold out false hopes. It is not we who have held out false hopes. It is you who, by the provisions of the Act of 1903, and by the language used about it, have raised false hopes. They have been created and they do exist; and we have therefore thought it necessary and right to complete that great and noble work which the Act of 1903 undertook—an Act which I have always said reflected the greatest credit upon the Government which passed it, but which remains incomplete unless you give to this part of its provisions full and complete satisfaction. It is in order that we may fulfil the pledges we have inherited that we offer this Bill to your Lordships' House.

Question put and agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

Amendments reported (according to Order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

LEEDS (SOUTH PARADE CHAPEL) CHARITY BILL.

KINGSWOOD (WHITFIELD TABERNACLE SCHOOLROOM, ETC.), CHARITY BILL.

LONGTON (CAROLINE STREET CHAPEL) CHARITY BILL.

Read 3ª (according to Order), and passed.

House adjourned at a quarter before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, at a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 6th August, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [Lords] (by order). As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to.—Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill, Swansea Harbour Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to.—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [Lords], Portishead District Water Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented—of Colonial Report, No. 533 (Weihaiwei, Report for 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES (1905-6).

Copy presented—of Abstract of the Returns of Shipping Casualties which occurred on or near the Coasts or in Rivers and Harbours of the United Kingdom from the 1st July, 1905, to 30th June, 1906, and of the Returns of Shipping Casualties to British Vessels elsewhere than on the Coasts of the United Kingdom, and to Foreign Vessels on or near the Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours, of British Possessions Abroad, &c., with Charts and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Reduction of the Coastguard Service.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any stations of the Coastguard are short of men; and, if so, which are they, how long have they been short of their complement, and when will they be filled up.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) In some cases the complements of the stations have been found to be in excess of present requirements, and are being gradually reduced in accordance with the policy initiated by the late Board and continued by the present Board.

Observance of Saints Days at Ditton School, Ilminster.

MR. MONTGOMERY (Somersetshire, Bridgwater): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that at Ditton Street school, Ilminster, it has been the custom for years past that, on certain days of the Church of England, the children whose parents belong to that Church should attend service thereat instead of having their scripture lesson in school; whether this is in accordance with the regulations of the Board of Education; and whether May Day and Empire Day are properly described as days exclusively set apart for religious observance by the Church of England.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Matters of school attendance are primarily the concern of the local education authority, and I am not aware of any complaint having been made to the authority in this case. The by-laws of the local education authority in this instance, as approved by the Board of Education, seem to be in no way irregular. From the information in the Question I am unable to say that there has been a breach of any regulations of the Board of Education in the incidents referred to. In reply to the concluding paragraph, I cannot pretend to be an authoritative exponent of what the views of the Church of England are as to whether May Day and Empire Day are days to be "exclusively set apart for religious observance," but I am not aware that those are the grounds upon which the children of the school in question were absent from the school on the days named, nor, so far as I have observed, does the ordinary practice bear out that view.

Painting of Letter Boxes.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the recommendation of the Select Committee that letter boxes should be provided by the Department, it is now incumbent upon the sub-postmasters to pay for the painting of the same.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No change has yet been made in the rules regarding the provision of letter boxes. In considering the recommendations of the Committee the point mentioned by the hon. Member will be borne in mind.

Police Commission—Case of Ex-constable George Deed.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been drawn to the proceedings of the Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Police, when an ex-police constable named George Deed confessed upon oath that, at the previous sitting of the Commission, he had deliberately perjured himself; whether this witness was severely reprimanded by the Chairman, who told him that he had placed himself in a very serious position indeed, and that it would be the duty of the Commission to consider whether any action ought or ought not to be taken against him; and whether he proposes, in the interests of the police force, to prosecute this man.

(*Answered by Sir John Walton.*) I have no information upon this subject. The matter is one for the consideration of the Commissioners of Police, who may be relied upon to take nyy necessary steps in the interests of the police force.

Irish Teachers' Pensions.

Mr. MURPHY, (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of teachers admitted to A (1) pensions from 1879 to 1889, 1889 to 1899, and 1898 to 1907, respectively; if he can give the number who, having reached the age for retirement, are now awaiting admission; and if they will be allowed to continue to serve until admitted to the pension rights of their class.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On the foundation of the pension fund in 1879 the number of teachers admitted to the pension establishment of the first division of the first class was 230. The number admitted from 1880 to 1888, inclusive, was 145; from 1889 to 1897, inclusive, 195; and from 1898 to 1906, inclusive, 131.

No teachers who have reached the age for compulsory retirement are awaiting admission to the pension establishment in question. There is no provision in the pension rules for admitting teachers to such pension establishment after they have reached the age for compulsory retirement.

Payment of Dockyard Labourers doing Skilled Work.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.). To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that smart labourers are employed at painting and doing other skilled work; and, as these men have become proficient in the lesser-skilled part of painting, he can see his way clear to pay them the trade union rates of wages, as paid by private firms for such employment.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part of the Question, the policy of the Admiralty was defined by me in the debate on the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Chatham on 1st March, 1906. No change is contemplated.

Assessments in Scotland.

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): To ask the Lord Advocate whether the superior is rated to any of the public burdens arising in his superiority upon the amount received from his vassals as casualties of composition upon singular successions; and whether such amount is in any way a subject of taxation either as a separate subject or as a part of the composite land value of the heritage.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) No, Sir, casualties are not rated for local public burdens.

Beautifying Trafalgar Square.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will consider the possibility of beautifying the open asphalt spaces in Trafalgar Square by placing therein a few large boxes or tubs containing ornamental shrubs or flowers; whether he is aware that such boxes might be placed upon wheels and removed in case of public meetings, following the example of certain Continental cities; and that no opposition would then be offered by those who wish to preserve the right of free speech which at present exists.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I find there would be considerable objections even to removable boxes.

Orders for Lee-Enfield Rifles at Enfield Small Arms Factory.

MR. BRANCH (Middlesex, Enfield): To ask the Secretary of State for War what orders for Lee-Enfield barrels and bodies combined have been placed with the Royal Small Arms Factory, Enfield, during the last three years; what have been the separate numbers of each order and whom from; whether from India, Home, or the Colonies; and the date of each order so placed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I would remind the hon. Member that a minimum establishment has now been fixed for Enfield, viz., 1,900 to 2,000 (slightly less than the number now employed there) and the work will be so arranged that this number is kept in constant employment, unaffected by the date and amount of foreign orders. I trust that in these circumstances my hon. friend will dispense with the figures referred to in his Question, which cover a great deal of space and are most inconvenient to print.

Audit Department — Promotion of Examiners.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that the claims to promotion of certain members of the old examiner class in the Exchequer and Audit Department who, about 1st November, 1905, were called on to retire on pension are now considered when superior vacancies arise, he will explain how the interests of these men were consulted by thus calling on them to retire on pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The officers referred to were not called upon to retire, but were afforded an opportunity of doing so. This course was considered to be desirable in the interests of the officers themselves as well as of the Department.

Promotion in the Colonial Audit Department.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether three clerks in the Colonial Audit Branch, who never passed Civil Service examinations for their positions and who were on a scale of salary £70–£5–£100, precisely the same as the Second Division scale, were, with less than six years service in the case of one, and with less than two years service in the case of the other two, promoted to £100 per annum as from 1st July, 1906; and, if so, seeing that there were four acting examiners in this branch with less than £100 per annum, and with four to five years service, who passed Civil Service examinations and who were doing precisely the same kind of work as their more favoured colleagues, will he explain why these acting examiners were not promoted to £100 per annum on 1st July, 1906, and why the other three were so promoted.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) On the amalgamation of the Colonial Audit Branch with the Exchequer and Audit Department the three clerks in question were already members of the Colonial Audit Branch staff, and, on selection for the post of examiners, became entitled to the initial scale of the post, namely, £100 a year. The four other clerks referred to were clerks of the Second Division temporarily lent from the main office, and are not eligible for appointment as examiners until after the completion of eight years service.

Promotion in Audit Department.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing that civil servants must look for promotion principally in the Departments to which they are assigned, that before the Treasury could entertain a proposal to promote an assistant clerk in one Department, on the ground of special merit, to the Second Division, with a view to his assignment to another Department, it would be necessary that the heads of the two Departments should concur in an application to the Treasury to this end, that no such case of transfer on promotion has ever arisen, that no provision has been made in the reorganisation of the Exchequer and Audit Department for the promotion of deserving abstractors according to their conditions of service, that many of these abstractors in the Exchequer and Audit Department are now doing work which was but recently done by Second Division clerks, that they are now in receipt of only 25s. a week, or less salary than that given to nominated messengers in this Department, while three clerks of only five or six years service are in receipt of nearly £400 per annum each, he will explain whether the Comptrollor and Auditor-General, in introducing these abstractors into his Department, never contemplated the promotion of any of them, no matter what merit may be shown by them; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) As I have already informed the hon. Member, none of the abstractors in question have completed the minimum service requisite before their claims to promotion can be considered.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that there are three clerks in the Exchequer and Audit Department, two of whom entered the service in October, 1902, and the third in October, 1900, in receipt of £365 per annum each; that the highest salary received by any other clerk in the Department with the same length of service is £100 per annum; that each of these three clerks, on the recent reorganisation of the Department on 1st November, 1905, received an addition to their salaries of £155, £155, and £125, respectively; and, seeing that all the Second Division clerks in the Department with eight years service and upwards were promoted to the Higher Division and were not granted any immediate increase of salary, will he say why these three clerks with such short service, who are now senior and superior to 140 men, about three-fourths of the whole staff, who entered the Department before them and many of whom have six or seven times their service, were not placed on the seniority list according to their annual rates of pay intead of having their salaries nearly doubled.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) No change has been made in the relative seniority of the three officers referred to, who, previous to the reorganisation of 1st November, 1905, were clerks of the FirstDivision and members of the directing staff, and, as such, senior to the whole of the Second Division establishment. Being thus already in a senior position in the office they naturally had priority in selection to fill vacancies in the newly-constituted grade of chief examiners on a scale of pay £350–£15–£500. The Second Division clerks who were similarly selected received the same scale of pay.

Income of London Non-Provided Schools.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the President of the Board of Education what was the total income for maintenance of the London non-provided elementary schools in the year 1902, received respectively from voluntary subscriptions and from endowments, distinguishing, if possible, between the different religious denominations.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Income of Non-Provided Elementary Schools from Voluntary Contributions and Endowments in year 1901–2 (Statistical year ending 31st July, 1902).

London.

Denomination.	Voluntary Contributions	Endowments.
	£	£
Church of England	54,260	14,648
Wesleyan - - -	1,544	*Nil*
Roman Catholic -	13,932	1,037
Undenominational and other denominations -	16,472	13,747
Total - -	86,208	29,432

The above figures are complete so far as is shown by the information in the possession of the Board, but the Board cannot guarantee their accuracy.

Drainage of Buildings—Control of Local Government Board.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Local Government Board have no jurisdiction with regard to the enforcement of by-laws with respect to the drainage of buildings; and, if so, whether he would take steps to give the Local Government Board such control.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Local Government Board have no power to enforce the observance of by-laws made by local authorities, and I doubt whether it would be practicable for them to exercise such powers if they possessed them.

Discharges of Labourers by the Hampstead Borough Council.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board could he say how many labourers have been discharged by the Hampstead Borough Council within the past twelve months; and could he say what amount, if any, has been saved to the ratepayers by such discharges.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The only information I have on the subject is to the effect that, as from the end of March, the staff of workmen employed by the borough council was reduced by the discharge of twenty-four men, and that the wages of these men amounted to £34 per week.

Assistance to the Blind in London.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that, according to the census of 1901, there were in London 3,556 blind persons, and to the further fact that under 250 blind persons are employed in workshops in London; and whether, seeing that numbers of blind persons are dependent on assistance from the rates or from charitable sources, and that charitable organisation has completely failed to provide adequate workshop accommodation, he can hold out any hopes of reconsidering his decision as to State assistance in this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am sorry that I cannot add anything to the Answer which I gave to my hon. friend in reply to his Question of the 1st inst.†

Evicted Tenants—Application of Denis Healy.

MR. JOHN MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have yet come to any decision in reference to the application of Denis Healy to be reinstated in his farm at Knockanes, county Kerry.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxix., 1198.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have been unable to effect the reinstatement of Denis Healy in the farm which was formerly held by him, and which is now occupied by his brother-in-law. The Commissioners, however, will consider Denis Healy's application in connection with the distribution of any untenanted land which they may acquire.

Sale of Untenanted Land on the Blacker-Douglas Estate.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the untenanted land on the Blacker-Douglas estate, at Tullihinal, North Kerry, which was offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners to enlarge uneconomic holdings and reinstate evicted tenants, has been inspected; and, if so, whether he can state with what result; what is the price asked by the landlord; and what is the price offered by the Estates Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have had an inspection made of the untenanted land on this estate and have directed their inspector to furnish further information on the subject, on the receipt of which the Commissioners will consider what amount they could advance for the purchase of the land under the Act of 1903. The owner has not named a price for the land.

Suggested Railway from Listowel to Tarbert.

MR. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of a Resolution, passed unanimously by the Kerry County Council on 16th May, 1907, in favour of a short line of railway from Listowel to Tarbert *via* Newtowndillon and Ballylongford; whether he is aware that Mr. Bryce, late Chief Secretary for Ireland, expressed himself in favour of the project; and whether the Chief Secretary will, at a convenient time during the Autumn Recess, visit the district in order to inquire into the necessity and urgency of this work.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have received a copy of the Resolution referred to. I am not aware that my predecessor ever expressed himself in favour of the projected railway; on the contrary, I find that Mr. Bryce recorded his opinion that the proposed line could never come near paying its way, and that, if public money should become available for railway schemes, there were many other schemes which would have a prior claim. There is obviously no prospect that assistance from public funds can be given to the project at an early date, if at all, and in the circumstances there would be no object in my visiting the district.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

German Navy Bill.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what increase of expenditure since 1904–5 the present German Navy estimates represent; whether he can state the further increase for next year sanctioned under the German Navy Bill, 1906; and whether these sums allow for the further recent enlargement of the German programme for the purpose of increasing the dimensions and armaments of the German cruisers.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY, (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The hon. Member has himself indicated the sources from which alone the desired information can be obtained.

Cost of Refitting Battleships.

MR. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state what is the time usually occupied by the annual refit of a first-class battleship; what is the nature of the work then executed; and whether, for the better information of Members, he will exhibit a detailed statement of the work executed and the expense incurred in a recent normal annual refit.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The time usually occupied in carrying out the annual refit of a battleship is from five to eight weeks. The work executed is docking, cleaning and coating bottom with composition, examination of underwater fittings, making good defects of hull, engines, boilers, auxiliary machinery, boats, gun, torpedo and electrical fittings, and canvas gear. The cost varies from £4,000 to £7,000.

Birching in the Navy.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, with reference to Cd. 3628, Return of Punishments in the Royal Navy during 1906, what were the offences and sentences in each case of the twelve men sentenced to penal servitude, and the offences and sentences of each individual in the seven cases who suffered corporal punishment with birch, the date on which each birching took place, where it occurred, and why was this form of punishment inflicted, having in view the statement he made to the House on the 21st February, 1906.†

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The information asked for in this Question can best be given in the form of a Return which will be granted if the hon. Member moves for it. The birching was inflicted in all cases before the Admiralty orders of the 30th January, 1906, had been promulgated to the Fleet.

Ayrshire Foundry Castings.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will furnish the names of His Majesty's ships at present on the active list containing castings supplied by the Ayrshire Foundry Company prior to the delivery of the rudder for the "King Edward VII.," and in each case specify against each ship what castings were supplied, giving full particulars of each casting; and whether the Admiralty have any guarantee, beyond Admiralty inspectors' reports, that any such castings were not tampered with in a similar manner to the "King Edward VII." rudder, with special reference to castings supplied to H.M.S. "Argyle."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: To furnish the information asked for would involve a great amount of labour which, in the opinion of the Admiralty, would not be justified by the results. With regard to the second Question, the castings have stood the test of actual service for some years without exhibiting defects.

Raunds Boot Dispute.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been directed to the fact that in January last Mr. Askwith, who had acted as arbitrator in the matter of the Raunds boot dispute and made certain awards, wrote to the War Office directing attention to certain evasions of the price statement which he had arranged; whether he is aware that Mr. Askwith has not yet received any reply to his letter; and whether he can explain the neglect of the War Office in this matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddingtonshire): The company in question went into liquidation and it was not practicable to deal with the points raised in the letter. This is the reason why the reply which would otherwise have been sent was not sent to Mr. Askwith. But the matter, so far from being overlooked, was fully gone into.

War Office Surveyors.

MR. RIDSDALE (Brighton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if any surveyors or assistant surveyors are acting as division officers, what extra remuneration they are receiving; and whether extra duty pay has been granted to some who are so acting, but not to all, and if so, why.

MR. HALDANE: Surveyors and assistant surveyors are liable, under the Regulations, to be employed without extra remuneration for short periods as division officers during the temporary absence of the latter or for other causes. In exceptional cases of prolonged employment as division officer, extra duty pay has occasionally been granted, each case being considered on its merits and determined according to the length of employment as division officer.

Army Contracts in Wales.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state in what counties in Wales and with what firms the contracts for £23,000 were placed last year.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clii., 362, 363, 370.

MR. HALDANE: The contracts were placed mainly in Glamorganshire as the articles bought were tin plates, nickel, foundry coke, etc. It is not considered expedient to publish the names of the firms in question.

Victoria Barracks, Windsor.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware of the inconvenience and expense caused to married soldiers of the 3rd Grenadier Guards now quartered at Windsor owing to delays in certain alterations to Victoria Barracks being carried out under the Director of Barracks Construction; and if he will say how many married families are being paid lodging allowance, and over what period it is anticipated such allowance will be granted; why the work should have been entirely stopped for fourteen weeks, and, if through the contractor's bankruptcy, why the work was not proceeded with under the usual terms of War Department contracts; and what will be the total cost to the public of lodging allowance and other expenses connected with the delay.

MR. HALDANE: Twenty-five married families are in receipt of lodging allowance. The delay in the work of remodelling the married quarters was due to the bankruptcy of the contractors in April. Steps were immediately taken under the terms of the contract for the completion of the service but further delays arose pending the settlement of certain claims put forward by the official receiver to the plant and materials on the site and to monies alleged to be due to the late contractors' estate. It is anticipated that the whole of the work will be completed by the early part of September.

Carrickfergus Ordnance Depot.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the circumstances under which a foreman in the Army Ordnance Department, Dublin District, was promoted to be principal foreman at the Ordnance depot at Carrickfergus over the heads of senior and competent men with greater length of service, both military and civilian; had the foreman promoted any military experience at all; and were the men passed over men with the highest testimonials as to character and efficiency.

MR. HALDANE: Principal foreman T. Kelly, having one of his children seriously ill at Dublin and being advised by the medical man attending her that she must not return to Carrickfergus, applied for and obtained sanction to exchange places with foreman W. Booth on the understanding that no expense to the public would be involved. The latter had no military service, but the exchange was recommended by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, who doubtless considered this foreman the most suitable.

Lanmadaw Evictions.

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has received a memorial from above 700 persons living in the part of Rangoon called Lanmadaw; whether it is likely that these persons will be evicted from their homes unless they consent to the new conditions of tenure offered by the Government of Burma; and whether there is any civil court in that province, with jurisdiction to try the question of title as between them and the Government or to accept a plaint if presented by them.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): I considered in Council the memorial and decided that there was no sufficient ground for interference. The memorialists, if they do not accept the terms on which leases for ninety years have been offered to them, will be required to vacate the land, but compensation, as provided by the Lower Burma Town and Village Lands Act, will be given. Under that Act the civil courts have no jurisdiction.

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) asked whether, although the people were being evicted from their homes on this land ostensibly for public purposes, the real reason was that the local Government intended, after raising the level of the sites, to sell them by auction to the highest bidder and make a handsome profit out of the transaction; and whether steps could not be taken, as in the case of the Irish evicted tenants of which the House had lately heard so much, to enable these unfortunate Burmese residents of Lanmadaw to get back their holdings on reasonable terms?

MR. MORLEY said he was not prepared to accept the suggested difference between the real and the ostensible reason, but if the hon. Member would speak to him privately he would see if anything more could be done.

Young Indians in England.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that friendless young Indians arriving in England frequently, and not wholly by accident, fall into undesirable hands; and whether he will, so far as may be feasible, make arrangements whereby such young Indians can obtain the advice and assistance of which they stand in need.

MR. MORLEY: This Question, together with others relating to the well-being of young Indians in this country, is now being considered by a special Committee which I have appointed for the purpose.

Arrests of Indian Editors.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the sentences of five years imprisonment passed upon the editors of the vernacular papers, *India* and *Hindustan*; whether he can state if the editors were summarily arrested after the issue of their papers, or summoned to appear on a stated charge before the Courts; and whether he can state under what law or regulations they were so arrested or summoned to appear before the Courts.

MR. MORLEY: The editors were dealt with under Sections 124A and 131 of the Indian Penal Code. The offence is one for which a warrant is ordinarily issued in the first instance.

MR. O'GRADY: Is it usual to handcuff persons when arrested under the Code?

MR. MORLEY: I am not aware that they were. I will inquire.

MR. O'GRADY: They were in this case.

Lahore Rioters' Sentences.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the sentences of eighteen months imprisonment passed upon six men as a result of the riots at Lahore, also to one of nine months on another man and one of flogging of thirty stripes on a youth, both involved in the same riots; whether he has power to intervene and order revision of the sentences of imprisonment; and whether he can, and will, in future give instructions that no sentences of floggings shall be given where it is obvious that imprisonment will meet the case.

MR. MORLEY: I have seen reports of the cases referred to. I see no reason to intervene. The question whether imprisonment will meet any particular case is for the authority that tries the case to decide; but I am about to address the Government of India on the general subject of flogging. I may add that in the case to which my hon. friend refers the sentence has not been carried out, as the youth has been certified medically to be unfit to undergo the punishment.

MR. O'GRADY: Then in that case the sentence of flogging will not be carried out?

MR. MORLEY: Certainly not.

Bengal Police Libel Actions.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Government of Bengal gave leave to six police officers to institute a civil action for libel against three papers on a criticism of mismanagement of the prosecution of the Sova Bazar murder case, the action being eventually heard against the *Indian Daily News*; whether the Government privately guaranteed the cost of the action in the event of the policemen winning; and whether it is to be understood in future that any officials criticised by any paper are free to sue for damages at the public expense.

MR. MORLEY: The rules regulating the conduct of Government servants prohibit a Government servant from having recourse, without the previous sanction of the Government, to any Court for the vindication of his public acts or character from defamatory attacks. In granting such sanction the Government must in each case decide whether it will itself bear the costs, or whether the Government servant shall institute the proceedings at his own expense, and, if so, whether, in the event of a decision in his favour, the Government shall reimburse him to the extent of the whole or any part of the costs. It was in accordance with these rules that the Government of Bengal acted in the case referred to. The judge held that there had been a serious libel; and I need not remind my hon. friend of the difference between fair criticism and defamation.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): What would have happened had the newspaper won the case? Would the Government have paid the costs?

Mr. MORLEY: I am afraid I cannot say.

Panama Canal Labour.

Mr. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Government of Jamaica have refused to allow labourers to be indentured in that island for services on the Panama Canal; and if Papers can be laid dealing with the negotiations between the Government of the island and the Commissioners of the Isthmian Canal.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of State for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): It is not correct to say that the Government of Jamaica have refused to allow labourers to be indentured in that Colony for service on the canal; but the representatives of the canal authorities failed to come to an agreement with the local government as to the terms on which recruiting should be permitted. The Secretary of State sees no sufficient reason for laying Papers on the subject of the negotiations.

Customs Rebates on South African War Supplies.

Mr. HOLT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies have admitted any part, and, if so, how much, of the claims made against them for customs and railway rebates on oversea supplies purchased on behalf of the Army since January, 1903.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has no cognisance of the claims mentioned by the hon. Member.

Mr. Churchill's African Tour.

Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether during his approaching visit to Africa he can arrange to spare a short time for the adjacent Protectorate of British Central Africa, wherein his presence would be much appreciated and would be productive of much benefit.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I should greatly desire to visit Nyassaland, but I am afraid that such an extension of my journey would interfere with my duties to the House.

Uganda Railway Annuities.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the instalment of annuity of £319,112 to be paid to the National Debt Commisssioners for the Uganda Railway will be payable in full each year until the debt for the construction of that railway is extinguished, or will the annuity be reduced by the amount of any annual profits which may be earned by the railway; and to whom will the railway belong when the debt is paid off.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The annuity will be payable in full for the present as it is considered that the interests both of the British taxpayer and of the East African and Uganda Protectorates will be better served by applying the annual profits to the development and extension of the railway with a view to increasing still further the profits derived from it. If the present arrangements are continued, the railway will belong to the Imperial Government when the debt is paid off.

Chambers of Commerce and the Brussels Convention.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what representations have been received from chambers of commerce in this country with regard to the attitude of the Government towards the Brussels Convention.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Representations on the subject referred to by the hon

Member have been addressed to the Colonial Office by the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, the West India Association of Glasgow, and the Greenock Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures.

Congo Free State Consuls.

Mr. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Government of the Congo Free State has consular representatives in this country; and, in that case, who those consular representatives are.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): Mr. Jules Houdret and Mr. L. T. Grein have respectively been appointed Consul-General and Consul in London for the Congo Free State. Mr. Charles Sarolea, Sir Alfred Jones, and Mr. L. A. Gallé were appointed Consuls of the State at Edinburgh, Liverpool, and Manchester respectively. I have not heard of any of these appointments having been cancelled or given up.

Denmark and Iceland.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that the King of Denmark has issued a decree empowing the Danish Islands Commission to take the necessary steps for granting complete autonomy to Iceland, allowing the inhabitants to retain their civic rights as Danish subjects, and abandoning the power hitherto vested in the king of nominating one-sixth of the legislative body as well as the Minister who was at the head of the administration; and, if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table.

Sir EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Government have received no official information to the above effect. If such a decree has been published by the Danish Government, I shall be glad to obtain it.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR: Will it be laid on the Table?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I will first let the hon. Member see a copy, and he can then judge if it is of sufficient importance to lay it.

New Barracks at Cairo.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the cost of new barracks to be erected for the Army of Occupation at Cairo is to be shared between the British and Egyptian Governments; and, in that case, whether he can state in whom the ownership of the barracks will vest.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative. The existing barracks are Egyptian Government property (except a small part built by British War Office funds), and are held by the Army of Occupation so long as required for military purposes. The new barracks will also be the property of the Egyptian Government, and held on the same terms.

Egyptian Army of Occupation—Cost of Moving Troops.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the sum of £50,000, officially announced in May last as voted by the Egyptian Ministry of Finances to meet the costs of movements of troops of the Army of Occupation in 1906, is in addition to the sum of £200,000 agreed upon to be paid by the Egyptian Government towards the costs of the Army of Occupation and in addition to the sum recently voted for the construction of new barracks at Cairo for the Army of Occupation.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have no information as to the £200,000 referred to in the Question. The sum payable by the Egyptian Government to meet the extra cost of maintaining the British forces in Egypt since 1st April last is £150,000 a year. Prior to that date it was £100,000 a year. In addition to the £100,000 paid for the financial year 1906–7, a sum of £52,000 was paid in respect of the increase of troops in 1906. The arrangements as to the construction of new barracks at Cairo are outside these figures.

Egyptian Company Laws.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the fact that under Article 258 of the Japanese Commercial Code, which enacts that a foreign company which sets up a principal office in Japan, or which makes it its principal object to do business in Japan, must, even though it is formed in a foreign country, comply with the same provisions as though it were formed in Japan, a British company, whose head office is at Hong Hong, has lately been fined at Tokio for non-compliance with the Japanese company law; and whether, in view of recent financial scandals in Egypt, he will recommend the Egyptian Government to adopt the above-cited provision of the Japanese law.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As, under the existing system of capitulations, the assent of fifteen Powers is necessary before legislation applicable to a foreign company could be enacted in Egypt, it would be impracticable to make the proposed recommendation.

British Representatives Abroad—Pensions and Emoluments.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the emoluments of the representatives of this country abroad are usually made up to a large extent of various allowances which are not taken into account for the purpose of the calculation of their pensions on retirement; and, if so, whether, as a result of such a system, a pension is often out of proportion to the total emoluments; and whether he can see his way to place the matter on a better footing.

SIR EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's representatives abroad receive pensions under the Diplomatic Pensions Act, 1869. Their salaries and allowances are assessed in proportion to the positions which they occupy at foreign capitals, but such emoluments cannot be taken as a basis for the calculation of pensions. The amount of their pensions is, therefore, regulated by the rank which they have held in the diplomatic service.

Congo Free State Rubber Traffic—Subsidy to the African Steamship Company.

MR. BRAMSDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any subsidy is paid to the African Steamship Company by the British Government; and, if so, whether any steps were taken to ascertain whether this company were directly benefiting by the Congo Free State's rubber traffic before such subsidy was granted, having in view the disapproval which His Majesty's Government have frequently expressed with regard to the method by which the Congo State is being exploited.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this on behalf of the Postmaster-General. Payments are made to the company for the conveyance of mails, but not in the form of a subsidy. The Answer to the second part of the Question is in the negative.

Newfoundland Fisheries Dispute.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the present position of affairs as regards the fisheries question on the shores of Newfoundland and the American claims regarding it; when further Papers upon the matter will be laid upon the Table; and if His Majesty's Government are acting in the question in strict consonance with the advice of the Government of the premier British Colony.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer returned to the hon. Member for Gravesend on the 1st of August.† His Majesty's Government can give no promise that they will lay further Papers on the subject of the Newfoundland fisheries in the present stage of the negotiations. They are in communication with the Newfoundland Government.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Will Papers be eventually laid, and will the House have an opportunity of considering the matter?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot say when the negotiations will come to an end.

Price of Consols—Savings Bank Depositors.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can name any time within the life of the present generation at which Consols have fallen to so low a level as at the present time; and what steps he proposes to take to restore the national credit, and to save the depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank who have been induced to invest the product of their thrift in Consols from the losses attending the realisation of their little capital.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxix., 1211.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): With 2½ per Cent. Consols at 82½, the cost of an annuity of £3 is £99. In 1885 a similar annuity from Consols (then a 3 per cent. stock) could be purchased for £94 7s. 6d., while at no time between 1864 and 1878 would it have cost more than £98 10s. In 1866 it fell as low as £84. With regard to the rest of the hon. and gallant Member's Question, I do not think I can usefully add anything to my recent statements in this House in reply to similar questions and upon other occasions.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Could not notice be issued to Post Office Savings Bank depositors, warning them that they may lose—as some have already done—£30 per £100 by these investments?

MR. ASQUITH: Depositors are carefully warned in the regulations that the Government cannot guarantee them against loss.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in order to complete the statement given in the Finance Accounts of the contingent liabilities of the State, he can state the amounts by which the funds now held by the National Debt Commissioners are insufficient to meet the possible claims of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank, the trustees of trustee savings banks, and the trustees of friendly societies respectively.

MR. ASQUITH: It was the practice until recently to include in the statement given in the Finance Accounts an estimate of the contingent liability of the Consolidated Fund in respect of the funds in question. The estimate was arrived at by valuing the securities held for the funds at their current market price. But the Select Committee on the Savings Banks Funds in 1902 condemned such valuations as misleading in the case of these funds. Accordingly, since the passing of the Savings Banks Act, 1904, which carried out the recommendation of the Committee, the estimate of possible liability has been omitted, and has been replaced by a general statement that the Consolidated Fund is liable to make good any amount by which the several funds may prove deficient.

Income Tax Rebates.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the delay which takes place in repaying to income-tax payers with an income entitling them to an abatement or remission of tax the amount of such abatement or remission, which has been deducted from their income before it reaches their hands; and whether, in view of the hardship that this delay inflicts on those often very poor men who are entitled to remission or abatement, he will take steps to put an end to such delay.

MR. ASQUITH: I am aware that, owing to the immense accumulation of claims within a few months of the year and to the close investigation necessary to ensure the Department against paying away money to which the claimant's title has not been conclusively proved, there is during the summer months a considerable delay in the settlement of claims. Every effort, however, is made by the Board of Inland Revenue to minimise this delay, both by the adoption of the most expeditious methods of dealing with the work and by the employment of the staff on long and continuous overtime. Much as I regret the inconvenience thus caused to the public, I fear that it is impossible, consistently with the due security of the Revenue, to devise any method of reducing it further.

LORD R. CECIL: Is it not rather hard on the person entitled to repayment that he should not be paid interest on the money while it is withheld from him?

MR. ASQUITH'S reply was inaudible.

Exeter Income Tax Distraint.

SIR G. KEKEWICH: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to recent distraints levied on tradesmen for non-payment of income-tax, and especially to one levied on the goods of Mr. Harry Hems, of Exeter; whether any complaints have reached the Inland Revenue Commissioners as regards the assessment of tradesmen in that city; and whether he will make inquiries with a view to taking steps to avoid such distraints in future.

MR. ASQUITH: I have no information regarding recent distraints upon Exeter tradesmen, nor have the Board of Inland Revenue received any complaints as to the assessment of tradesmen generally in that city. My attention has not been called to the particular case mentioned by my hon. friend, but I will cause inquiry to be made with regard to it. The necessity for distraint appears to me to arise rather from the inaction of the taxpayer than the action of the Revenue authorities, but my hon. friend may be assured that everything which can be done will be done to secure the punctual payment of the tax without resort to extreme measures.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): Why were these distraints delayed so long in Exeter when tradesmen in Edinburgh had to pay so long ago as 26th February last?

MR. ASQUITH: I know nothing as to the facts.

SIR G. KEKEWICH: If I give the right hon. Gentleman details will he consider the case?

MR. ASQUITH: Certainly.

Mines Commission and the North Wales Quarries.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will undertake that some Welsh-speaking representative of the quarrymen shall be a member of the Mines Commission when such Commission deals with the question of the working of open slate quarries in North Wales.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The Royal Commission will not reach that part of their inquiry which deals with quarries for some time yet. When they do so I will consider my hon. friend's suggestion.

Shirley Poor Law Schools.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the weekly cost per child of the children in the Shirley Poor Law Schools; how much of this is expended on maintenance, administrative charges, loan, and sinking fund; whether the weekly charge is less this year than last; whether any, and, if any, how many, of the boys are required to work on the farm and girls on housework as half-timers; and whether he can state the percentage of children passing the sixth standard before leaving the school.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The average weekly cost per child in the year ending Michaelmas, 1906, was 20s. 6½d. Of this, the sum of 5s. 9½d. represented the average cost of maintenance, 8s. 8½d. the average cost in respect of the staff and miscellaneous expenditure, and 6s. 0½d. the charges in respect of loans. The average weekly cost per child in the year ended Michaelmas, 1905, was 21s. 7¼d. I understand that there are no half-timers in the school. I am not informed as to the percentage of children who have passed the sixth standard before leaving.

MR. HAROLD COX: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the figures for the previous year?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes; the figures for the last three years are; 1904, 29s.; 1905, 21s. 7¼d.; 1906, 20s. 6½d.

Coffee Adulteration.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that proceedings were instituted last month against a vendor of a mixture as coffee, of which 70 per cent. was chicory, and that the magistrates dismissed the case, though 1s. per per pound was paid; and, if the case be as stated, whether he will take action to protect the producers and consumers of coffee.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have seen a report of the case to which I presume my hon. friend refers. The facts would appear to be as stated, but I would point out that the magistrates seem to have been satisfied that the vendor had given notice by a label written on the bag that the article sold was coffee and chicory, and also that there was no intention on the part of the vendor to defraud. On the general question of the sale of mixtures of coffee and chicory I do not think I can add anything to the Answers I gave to the Questions which my hon. friend put to me on the 20th June last.†

Grant for the Distressed.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is proposed to allot the same amount of money, viz., £200,000, this year for the purpose of assisting distress committees under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, as was allocated last year; and, having in view the action of the President of the Local Government Board in returning to the Exchequer £80,000 of that sum, and that no opportunity has been afforded of discussing that matter on the President's salary, can he give the House an assurance that this year it will all be spent in the alleviation of misery, suffering, and want, brought about through lack of employment.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The Prime Minister has asked me to reply to this Question. The same amount has been voted this year as last, viz., £200,000, for contributions in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905. As regards payments out of last year's Grant to particular local bodies under the Act, I was only concerned with such payments so far as they related to England and Wales. I made payment in all cases in which the local bodies showed that there was exceptional need for assistance in meeting the cost of providing or contributing to the provision of temporary work, and a scheme of work was proposed of which I could approve. I also gave some assistance towards the expenses of emigration when undertaken by these bodies. More than this I could not properly do, and as the whole of the Grant was not required for the purpose in view, there was of necessity a balance which had to be returned into the Exchequer. The amount to be expended out of the grant just voted must depend on what are found to be the requirements of next winter. I could not give any assurance that the whole sum voted will be spent.

MR. LEA: Is it not a fact that in consequence of the action of the right hon. Gentleman, women's workshops have been closed all over the place, and, in particular, in my constituency?

MR. JOHN BURNS: There are only three workwomen's rooms in London.

MR. LEA: I have got one of them in my constituency.

Secondary School Regulations.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he asked the opinion of the Consulative Committee as to the recent changes in the regulations for secondary schools; and, if so, what was the nature of the advice given.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the recent changes in the regulations for secondary schools were the outcome of advice he received from educational bodies; and, if so, will he state their names and the nature of the advice they tendered.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (MR. LOUGH, Islington, W.): I can assure the hon. Member that my right hon. friend has had no lack of advice as to the framing of regulations for secondary schools and indeed for every kind of school, but he does not think it would be either usual or desirable for him to name the persons or bodies whom he may have consulted before taking action for which he, as Minister, is responsible. I may say, however, that the matter was not referred to the Consultative Committee.

Swansea Voluntary School Teachers.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the dispute as to the salaries of the teachers in the voluntary schools at Swansea has yet been settled; and, if not, what position it is now in.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxvi., 616–7.

MR. LOUGH: The Answer to the first paragraph is in the negative. My right hon. friend received a deputation from the managers last month and is awaiting a reply from the local education authority to a communication he sent to them on this subject.

LORD R. CECIL: What was the date of the communication?

MR. LOUGH: I do not know; I will inquire.

International Congress on School Hygiene.

SIR G. KEKEWICH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board informed the representatives of the International Congress on School Hygiene that they would neither send delegates to the congress themselves nor move the Foreign Office to issue invitations to foreign Governments to appoint delegates; whether the Board has now reversed that decision; and, if so, whether he can state the reason for the change of policy.

MR. LOUGH: No, Sir, the Board of Education informed the organisers of the congress from the outset that they would be glad to send official representatives to the congress and they have since done so. As regards foreign Governments, the Board of Education and the Government were obviously unable themselves to invite foreign Governments to send representatives to a congress which was not a Government congress but organised privately; but it was, from the beginning, arranged that the invitations to the congress should be sent to the foreign Governments through the medium of the Foreign Office, though not, of course, as being an invitation from the Government. This was done, and is the course that was adopted in the case of the first congress in 1904. I am obliged to my hon. friend for giving me this opportunity of saying that there has been no change of policy or attitude or decision towards the congress on the part of the Board of Education, who have from the outset been glad to assist the congress.

SIR G. KEKEWICH was understood to ask if the Board of Education had sent delegates to the congress; if invitations had been issued to foreign countries through the Foreign Office, and if any pressure was put on the Board of Education to get invitations issued.

MR. LOUGH: Subject to there being no mysterious meaning in the word "delegates" I may say the Board of Education has sent delegates. The remainder of the Question I have already answered.

Board of Education Statistics.

SIR G. KEKEWICH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will consider if it is practicable to publish the statistics of the Board of Education in three separate volumes for public elementary, secondary, and technical schools, respectively, instead of in one large volume, as last year, so that the statistics for each class of schools may be more cheaply obtained by the teachers interested in them.

MR. LOUGH: The statistics relating to the various branches of the Board's work were recently brought together in one volume, both for convenience of reference and also to emphasise the essential unity of all branches of education, and I am inclined to think that, at present at any rate, the balance of advantage is in favour of this system; but, apart from the merits of my hon. friend's suggestion, it is hardly feasible to publish the statistics of the Board in the three separate volumes suggested by him, because, amongst other reasons, the education given in the institutions with which the Board are concerned does not, in some cases, fall entirely within any one of the three heads named.

Crown Prosecutions in Ireland.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he will state the number of cases in which he and the Solicitor-General for Ireland have personally prosecuted for the Crown since 1st April, 1907; and what has been the result in each case.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): Since the date named, the law officers of the Crown in Ireland have prosecuted in person in six cases. In one case there was an acquittal; in two cases the jury disagreed; and in the remaining three cases the trials have been postponed with a view to moving for a change of venue.

Edwards Estate, Monasterevan.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Hawkins, sub-Commissioner, when fixing a second term rent upon the holding of Mr. Peter Dempsey, Coolnaferra, Monasterevan, Edwards estate, produced a map with Dempsey's farm marked in red ink by the agent when he came to inspect the land, and accused the tenant of being an advanced Nationalist and a member of the United Irish League; can he say if Dempsey received a reduction of only 8d. in the pound while other rents on the same property were reduced from 17 to 35 per cent.; and whether he proposes to recommend the reappointment of Mr. Hawkins when his term of office expires.

MR. CHERRY (for Mr. BIRRELL): The Land Commission have referred this Question to Mr. Hawkins, who states that there is absolutely no foundation for the suggestion that he accused the tenant of being an advanced Nationalist and a member of the United Irish League. When Mr. Hawkins first visited the farm the landlord was represented by the estate bailiff who produced the estate map. A dispute arose between the bailiff and the tenant as to the boundaries of the holding, and the inspection was therefore adjourned. Subsequently the parties agreed as to the boundaries of the holding, and Mr. Hawkins then visited the farm a second time and inspected it. The map used by him was the official map on record in the case, which shows the boundaries of the holding as pointed out to him by the tenant and eventually agreed to on behalf of the landlord. The Commissioners inform me that Mr. Hawkins is a gentleman in whose discretion and impartiality they have every confidence. I may add that if either party is aggrieved by the order of the sub-Commission he can apply to have the case reheard in the manner provided by Statute.

Sir Antony MacDonnell.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Sir Antony MacDonnell is visiting the West of Ireland in his official capacity; and, if so, with what object.

MR. CHERRY: The Under-Secretary visited the West of Ireland as a member of the Congested Districts Board authorised by the Board to consider with the Board's Chief Land Inspector, Mr. Doran, the question of the purchase, on a large scale, of grass lands for the Board's purposes. The results of Sir Antony MacDonnell's visit will be discussed at the next meeting of the Board on the 9th instant.

Insanitary Houses at Kilrush.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board will make inquiry into the condition of the houses on the property of the late Thomas Peacocke, in Kilrush; whether the Board is aware that the local sanitary inspector, Dr. R. Counihan, Mr. Morissy, the engineer, and Sir Achison M'Cullagh have reported that the majority of them are not fit for human habitation; and will the Local Government Board take action in the matter before sickness breaks out in those houses and spreads through the town.

MR. CHERRY: The officers named in the Question have made reports as to the insanitary condition of some houses in the Kilrush Urban District, but the Local Government Board have no information as to the ownership of these houses. It rests with the local authority to take action in the matter under the powers conferred upon them for that purpose by the Housing of the Working Classes Acts and the Public Health Acts.

Administration of the Labourers Acts.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the number of improvement schemes under the Labourers Acts which have been received by the Local Government Board, and whether the present inspectorial staff is able to meet the work in the time allowed by the Labourers Act of 1906; and, if not, will he see his way to appoint some additional inspectors from the district council service of Ireland.

MR. CHERRY: There are at present under the consideration of the Local

Government Board schemes from twenty-seven rural districts embracing 6,049 plots. The Board anticipate that the staff now at their disposal will be able to cope with the work under the Labourers Acts.

Irish Poor Law Medical Service.

MR. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the suggestions of Mr. O'Carroll with reference to the Poor Law medical service; and whether, seeing the universality of feeling in favour of the findings of the Viceregal Commission on Poor Law Reform, he will consider the advisability of having the Commissioners' attention drawn to the suggestions and to the feasibility of adopting the plan suggested by Mr. O'Carroll.

MR. CHERRY: My right hon. friend's attention has been called to Mr. O'Carroll's suggestions on this subject. The Viceregal Commission on Poor Law Reform has concluded its inquiry and presented its Report, and I regret to say say that it would now be impossible to submit further suggestions to the Commission.

Kilmallock Evicted Tenant.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how matters stand at present as to the reinstatement to his evicted holding of Joseph O'Rourke, of Clogher East, electoral division of Dromin, Kilmallock, county Limerick, who over sixteen years ago was evicted by his then landlord, Lord Langford, of Summerhill, county Meath; is he aware that subsequently the farm passed into the hands of the late Mr. John Gubbins, of Bruree, and is now in the hands of his successor, Mr. John Norris Browning, of the said place, Bruree, in county Limerick, who would, it is represented, if he got any fair compensation, restore Mr. O'Rourke to his farm; and will the Estates Commissioners exert themselves to bring the matter to that desirable end.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners inform me that O'Rourke's application for reinstatement will be duly considered by them when they are dealing with the estate on which the evicted farm is situate. The Commissioners will also consider the application in connection with the distribution of any untenanted land which they may acquire.

Ballinamona, Hospital, Lands, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that negotiations for sale and purchase have been for some time in progress between the representatives of the late Rev. George Vandeleur and his tenants on the lands of Ballinamona, Hospital, county Limerick; is he aware that four of the most influential tenants, comprising about 25 per cent. of the whole in number and rental, have refused to sign the agreements, fearing lest they hereafter would be unable to meet their yearly instalments through the facts that their rents are unusually high, the number of years' purchase on the rental equally so, and their lands being subject to periodic floods; and will he request the Estates Commissioners to send an inspector on the lands to see fair play done on both sides.

MR. CHERRY: Proceedings for the sale of the estate in question have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners. The estate will be inspected when it reaches its turn to be dealt with in order of priority, and the inspector will then make due inquiry into the cases of those tenants who may not have entered into agreements to purchase.

Kilcoleman Patrickswell Evicted Tenant.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he say what has been the result of the application to the Estates Commissioners made over a year ago by Mr. O'Farrel, of Kilcoleman Patrickswell, county Limerick, to be restored to his holding there from which he was evicted by his landlord, Mr. T. W. Ponsonby, of Thurles, county Tipperary.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners have fully considered the application in question, and have decided that they can take no action in the matter.

Knocklong Evicted Tenant.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say how matters stand at present as to the sale and purchase of their lands in and around Knocklong, county Limerick, between the Misses Cooper and their tenants; have John McGrath and Thomas Barry, evicted tenants thereon, been as yet restored to their farms; and will he ask the Estates Commissioners to treat on their behalf with the agents of the property, Messrs. Robert and Charles Sanders, Charleville, with a view to the restoration of McGarth and Barry.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners inform me that, with the assent of the landlord, they propose to arrange for an early inspection of the farms referred to, and that they will then consider the question of the restoration of the evicted tenants.

Manister Evicted Tenant.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether Edmond Hartigan, of Bettyville, Manister, county Limerick, who was restored to his evicted farm about last May, has as yet received any grant from the Estates Commissioners wherewith to repair the buildings and stock the lands.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they cannot see their way to make a grant to Edmond Hartigan.

Erasmus Smith Estate.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that negotiations for sale and purchase have been commenced between the governors of the Erasmus Smith property around Pallasgrean and Doon, and the tenants thereon; and will he ask the Estates Commissioners to put themselves into communication with the Messrs. Sanders, of Charleville, county Cork, agents to the estate, with a view to the restoration of the evicted tenants thereon, viz., John Harty, Lisheen, Timothy Burke, of Gurranebeg, and Joseph Ryan, of Knockderk.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners understand that negotiations are in progress for the sale of this estate under the Act of 1903. When the matter comes before the Commissioners the applications of the persons named in the Question will be duly considered.

Delmege Estate.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners have put themselves in communication with the Messrs. Sanders, of Charleville, county Cork, agents for the Delmege property, around Garryspillane and Glenbrohane, now being sold to the tenants, with the view of obtaining about 200 acres (Irish) on the estate, supposed to be untenanted, for the benefit of the poorer farmers' sons and the labourers; and will the Estates Commissioners allow the sale to proceed if one man, reputed to have taken 145 acres of this untenanted land since January, 1901, is allowed to retain it to the detriment of the farmers and labourers who have no land.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners are in communication with the vendor's solicitors in reference to the untenanted land on the Delmege estate. The Commissioners will carefully consider all the circumstances of the estate before sanctioning the advances applied for, but at this stage of the proceedings they cannot say what their decision may be.

Post Office and the Irish Land Stock.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will direct the attention of the proper official to the necessity for prescribing the manner in which purchasers under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, may avail themselves of the benefit of Section 2 of that Act by transferring through the Post Office Savings Bank Guaranteed Land Stock in payment of one-fourth of their annuities; is he aware that at the current price of the stock purchasers would gain about 3s. in the pound by paying instalments in that mode of payment instead of in cash.

I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the amount of Guaranteed Land Stock under The Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, at present outstanding; is the whole of the outstanding stock, or how much of it, registered at and transferable at the Bank of Ireland; is the stock regularly quoted and dealt in on the Dublin Stock Exchange; and what was the number of transfers registered in 1906 at the Bank of Ireland.

I beg further to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been called to the provisions of Section 2 of The Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1891, and particularly to that part of the section which provides that one-fourth of the tenant purchasers' annuity instalments may be discharged by transfer to the National Debt Commissioners of an equal nominal amount of Guaranteed Land Stock, and that such transfer may be made through the medium of a Post Office Savings Bank in the prescribed manner; has the manner of such transfer been prescribed by any rules; whose duty is it to make such rules; and why has the duty imposed by the section not been fulfilled.

MR. RUNCIMAN: As regards the main subject of this Question, to which my right hon. friend has asked me to reply, and of those which the hon. Member has addressed to me, I have nothing to add to the answers which I have already given. As I have pointed out in answer to a previous Question, the tenant purchaser who benefited by paying the one-quarter of his annuity in stock would obtain that benefit at the expense of other tenant purchasers who paid in cash. The amount of stock obtainable is too small to enable all tenant purchasers to pay the one quarter in stock, and it would not be fair to allow the advantage to only a few. I have ascertained that the amount of Guaranteed Land Stock at present existing is £12,698,231. Of this £12,684,491 is inscribed in the books of the Bank of Ireland, and the balance £13,740 in those of the Bank of England. I understand that the stock is quoted daily on the Dublin Stock Exchange, and that during 1906 the number of transfers in the books of the Bank of Ireland was 1,767.

Private Members' Bills.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can give facilities for the passing of the final stage of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, in view of the amount of discussion that it has received both in the House and in Committee.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): Early next week I hope to be able to say what the Government intend to do as to starring Bills. These will not be numerous.

Lord d'Auverquerque's Pension.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, with reference to page 55 of the Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom, what was the service rendered, either to the Crown or to the public, which was rewarded by an annual pension of £375 16s. under letters patent, 9th June, 1694, and now payable to Henry de Nassau, Lord d'Auverquerque; who is this individual; is he an alien; and what steps does he propose taking to put an end to this and other similar drains on the British public.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This pension, which amounted originally to £2,000 a year gross, was granted by letters patent in the sixth year of William and Mary to Lord d'Averquerque and his heirs and assigns for ever in consideration of his many and faithful services. The hon. Member will find a description of those services in the Dictionary of National Biography. The annual sum of £375 16s. is all that is now payable, the bulk of the pension having been commuted in 1853. There is no power to effect commutation except on terms acceptable to the present recipient. The pension has passed from hand to hand and was more than ten years ago purchased by the Bank of England.

Civil List Pensions.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury why the retired allowances, &c., to members of Her late Majesty's household, granted under 1 Edw. 7, c. 4, amounting to £18,184 7s. 6d., are all shown *en bloc* on page 53 of the Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom for the year ended 31st March, 1907, and not specified as in the case of pensions granted under 1 and 2 Vic., c. 95, to persons formerly on the Civil List of George IV. and William IV.; and will he give the names and ages of each pensioner, stating also what was the office formerly held by each, its duties, and their length of service to the late Queen.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The pensions which still survive from the Civil Lists of King George IV. and King William IV. are shown in detail in the Finance Accounts, I believe, because they are few in number and possess a certain historic interest. But the pensions payable to members of Her late Majesty's Household are about 240 in number. They are mostly small sums payable to persons who held very subordinate positions. I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by publishing the details asked for, which are not all in the possession of the Treasury. But I may refer the hon. Member to Section 7 of the Civil List Act, 1901, which provides for these pensions being charged on the Consolidated Fund.

MR. LEA: May I ask what steps the Treasury have taken to ascertain the ages of these pensioners and the services they rendered to William IV. and George IV? Are the pensioners the persons who rendered the original services?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think the ages are known. As is usual in such cases they are very great.

William IV. Civil List Pensions.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to page 53 of the Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom for the year ended 31st March, 1907, wherein it is stated that Charlotte Paley, Sophia M. Poussett, and Maria R. and George T. S. Winthrop are drawing pensions of £200, £25, and £200, respectively, under 1 and 2 Vic., c. 95, on the ground that these pensions were formerly on the Civil List of William IV.; and, considering the latter died in 1837, will he give the present ages of these pensioners and state what was the office formerly held by each, its duties, and their length of service to the deceased monarch.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: These are pensions which were granted by King William IV. to the children or grandchildren of persons whose services the Crown desired to recognise The present ages of three of the recipients are recorded as seventy-seven, eighty-five, and eighty-eight. In the other case there is no record. For particulars of the services rendered in these cases the hon. Member may like to refer to the Report of the Select Committee on Pensions in 1838.

George IV. Civil List Pensions.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to page 52 of the Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom for the year ended 31st March, 1907, wherein it is stated that Elizabeth Brooksbank and Eliza Clutterbuck are drawing pensions of £300 and £28 per annum respectively under 1 and 2 Vic., c. 95, on the ground that these pensions were formerly on the Civil List of George IV.; and, considering the latter died in 1830, will he give the present ages of these two pensioners, and state what was the office each formerly held, its duties, and their length of service to the deceased monarch.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Both ladies were daughters of civil servants and were granted pensions for life in respect of their father's services. According to particulars published by the Select Committee which inquired into these pensions in 1838, Miss Brooksbank should now be eighty-six, and Miss Clutterbuck, who died a few months ago, had reached the age of ninety-one. It is the invariable practice of such annuitants to live long.

Absent Ministers.

Several Ministers, to whom Questions were addressed, were not present at the moment these were reached.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) inquired what remedy the House had when Ministers failed to attend to answer Questions.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) asked if there was any remedy against the absence of private Members having Questions on the Paper.

*MR. SPEAKER said that in the case of a Minister being absent a private Member got a second shot at him, but in the case of the private Member being absent there was not necessarily a second barrel.

The Belfast Labour Dispute.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) asked the Attorney-General for Ireland, in the absence of the Chief Secretary, whether in view of the complete breakdown of the negotiations to bring about an amicable settlement of the Belfast labour disputes, the Government would, in the interests of industrial peace, bring pressure to bear on the employers to accept the arbitration of the Board of Trade, and would take steps to prevent the military and police being used in the interest of the employers to the detriment of the men.

MR. CHERRY suggested that the question should be deferred till the return of the Chief Secretary, who would be in his place, certainly next Thursday.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): Was any action taken on the report of the Committee of Inquiry of 1901 with reference to the condition of the Royal Irish Constabulary?

MR. CHERRY: I cannot answer that without notice.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Will not the Prime Minister use his influence to bring about arbitration?

[No Answer was returned.]

MR. CURRAN inquired if the military and the police in Belfast were not being used in the capacity of private workmen, thus tending to irritate the men involved in the dispute?

MR. CHERRY replied that that was not the case. The military were being used merely to preserve order and the police to protect carters passing through the city.

MR. CURRAN: Will the Government consider the advisability of withdrawing the troops?

MR. CHERRY: The troops were not sent by the Government. They were requisitioned by the Lord Mayor of Belfast under the common law, and the Government have nothing to do with the matter.

MR. LUNDON asked if it was not the case that there was disorder amongst the police themselves.

MR. CHERRY replied that there had been slight disorder in the police force in Belfast, but fortunately that had entirely calmed down now.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Did not ex-Constable Barrett publicly say that, while acting as a constable, he practically did the work of a van driver in Belfast?

MR. CHERRY: One should not attach too much importance to the statement of of a dismissed constable.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) asked if it were not the fact that all the police in Belfast prior to the outbreak of the labour dispute were being transferred to other parts of Ireland.

MR. CHERRY asked for notice.

MR. CROOKS: You say the Lord Mayor of Belfast requisitioned the troops. Have they Home Rule there?

MR. CHERRY: The powers of the civil authorities are exactly the same as in England.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of publishing the report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the state of the Royal Irish Constabulary in Belfast, which report has been kept secret?

MR. CHERRY: That question should be addressed to the Chief Secretary.

MR. SLOAN: Is it not the fact that many constables in Belfast who have taken no part in the dispute are under order to leave the city, and to leave their wives and families behind?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member appears to be contributing a statement rather than asking a question.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (added in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) and of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bills)—Mr. Charles Craig; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Values (Scotland) and of the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bills) —Mr. William Moore.

Report to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee B.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 288.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 288.]

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 302.]

PRIZE COURTS BILL [LORDS.]

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 304.]

RULE COMMITTEE BILL [LORDS.]

Read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 305.]

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Explanatory Statement of the Factory and Workshop Bill." —(*Mr. Samuel Herbert.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 289.]

NEW BILL.

MOTOR CAR (COLLISIONS AND ACCIDENTS) BILL.

To define the liability of the owners or persons in charge of motor cars in cases of collision or accident, presented by Mr. Bertram, supported by Mr. Buckmaster, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Rogers, and Viscount Helmsley; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 303].

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) moved the following Clause:—

"Nothing contained in this Act or done in pursuance thereof shall prejudice, affect, or interfere with the sole exercise by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries of all powers and duties under the provisions and for the purposes of the Diseases of Animals Acts." He said that as the Bill stood, powers were taken to alter the administration of the various Acts which had been passed from time to time by Parliament for the purpose of checking and stamping out diseases among animals. He did not know whether hon. Members interested in agricultural pursuits realised the magnitude of the question to the community as a whole. He remembered that it fell to his lot during the administration of the late Government to amend the Acts dealing with certain diseases. So strong was the view taken at the time of his methods by hon. Members opposite that they went so far as to predict if he (Mr. Long) were successful in carrying his amendments, there would be a large interference with the food supply of the people and prices would rise to famine rates. His amendments had been long ago carried and their objects successfully fulfilled. The protection of the health of the cattle in this country was of vital importance to the stock owning community. Such protection involved not only the difference between the health and unsoundness of our cattle but that of cattle of other countries, who at present came to us to buy animals for stock raising purposes because they knew they ran the minimum risk of disease. The Opposition had been frequently challenged that they were only enforcing restrictions with regard to Canadian cattle upon protective grounds. One of the main arguments, however, which had guided the Board of Agriculture, and which guided them at the present time, in the views they held upon this question was that, whatever might be the condition of the health of Canadian cattle, the position of that country, owing to her artificial boundary, rendered her liable to the invasion of disease from the United States and therefore made it necessary that restrictions should be enforced. In this country we had been singularly successful in repressing cattle disease The country was at one time full of disease, and the loss it caused in capital to the stockowners was simply enormous, whilst the interference with ordinary agricultural operations was of a most serious character. It was impossible to conceive a more effective check to the progress of agriculture than that caused by disease rampant among cattle. This state of things, however, had been altered by the application of rules and regulations which had enabled the Government to draw a ring round the islands, thereby making invasion by disease impossible. With regard to that terrible disease hydrophobia, not only would he have been unable, but he would not have attempted, to have stamped it out had he not been able to enforce the same regulations throughout Scotland and England. The Irish authorities, however, refused to come into line and agree to carry out these regulations, with the result that they had to be treated as a foreign country and the importation of all dogs from Ireland was prohibited. It would, however, be absolutely impossible to carry out such a policy if there were a different administration in Edinburgh. because the boundary between Scotland and England was only an artificial one and could be crossed at any moment by dog owners and their dogs. As the Bill stood, this proposed change in the administration of the law was to be dependant upon the discretion of the Secretary for Scotland.

AN HON MEMBER: And the Treasury.

MR. WALTER LONG said the Treasury was only to be responsible for the finance; the provision was only inserted in order to see that no undue expenditure was incurred, therefore it had no bearing upon his arguments. As he had said, the change in the administration was solely dependant upon the discretion of the Secretary for Scotland and he did not think that was wise. At present the powers were vested in the Board of Agriculture. He would like to know what view was taken by the Minister for Agriculture in regard to this treatment of his Department and the enforced transfer of powers—whether that Gentleman thought such change to be in the interests of good government and the successful administration of the Diseases of Animals Acts? He would like to know also whether this action had been taken with the concurrence of the Board of Agriculture? He believed rather than that, that it had been done in spite of the Board of Agriculture. The change proposed by the Bill was perfectly unnecessary. By setting up a new Department in Scotland they were proposing to do a most foolish thing in the interests of agriculture. It was far better that one man should represent the agricultural interests of Great Britain as a whole in that House and in the Cabinet. Again, the change had really nothing to do with the objects of the Bill. The Bill proposed to set up small holdings and to apply the Crofters Acts throughout Scotland. It also proposed to establish Agricultural Commissioners for that country who should deal with the question of security of tenure, agricultural matters, the general policy in regard to agriculture, and experimental work. There was no earthly reason why in addition to this, the Government, under the Bill, should seek to interfere with the present administration of the Diseases of Animals Acts. They would probably be told that there was no prospect of the Scottish Department differing from the views of the English Department in its administration of the Acts. He greatly doubted this. He remembered with regard to the introduction of cattle from abroad how the view taken by the Scottish Members differed from that of the majority of the House and how those Members tried to bring pressure to bear upon the Government in the interests of a particular class of cattle owners. Such pressure might be brought again, and he thought he was perfectly justified in saying that the policy of the Department in Scotland would probably differ from that of the English Department. It was quite impossible to exaggerate the importance of such a change as that which had been dragged by the heels into the Bill. If the Government would accept his new clause, it would not affect the Bill in any material degree, nor would it affect the *status* of the Commissioners. Instead they would be acting as the Government ought to act in the administration of these laws. By carrying out such a change they were running the risk of inflicting a grievous injury upon stockowners and agriculturists. The two countries should be treated as an island, and there should be no artificial boundary which might be crossed at any minute. He appealed to the Government not to deal lightly with the matter; unless they could put forward some very solid reason for making such a change they ought to accept his new clause.

New clause proposed—

"Nothing contained in this Act or done in pursuance thereof shall prejudice, affect, or interfere with the sole exercise by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries of all powers and duties under the provisions and for the purposes of the Diseases of Animals Acts."—(*Mr. Walter Long.*)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said that this question was discussed on the Committee. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] The subject dealt with by the right hon. Gentleman had been an integral part of the proposals of the Government ever since the Bill was first drafted and they looked upon it as essential. The case for this new clause had been stated by the right hon. Gentleman as well as it possibly could be, because he had an intimate knowledge of the Departments over which he presided for so many years. What were the proposals in the Bill? They were that the new Agricultural Commissioners for Scotland might be endowed with powers at the instance of the Secretary for Scotland to carry out the duties now exercised by the Board of Agriculture. Every precaution was taken in the Bill, and no transfer of those powers was likely to take place except upon the responsibility of the Government. Two Departments would be concerned in any such transfer, which would have to be the subject of a Cabinet decision. The powers exercised by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries were miscellaneous and included powers under the Tithes Acts, the Enclosure Acts and others, but none of those powers were of more importance than those which the right hon. Gentleman now proposed to exempt. The function of the Board of Agriculture was administrative and executive, and consisted in the discharge of statutory powers which to the farmers and owners of flocks and herds in Scotland were a most important part of the work of the Board. It was essentially work requiring local knowledge and prompt local executive action. He did not overlook the work of the Agricultural Board in regard to other parts of its administration, but the least successful part of its work was the administration of its duties under the Diseases of Animals Acts, and frequently there had been friction. He only needed to mention in this connection the sheep dipping order. Last year under the Agricultural Holdings Act power was given in Clause 1 to the Board of Agriculture to substitute a single arbiter in place of the old system, and it was a significant thing that in spite of the rally of the farmers to the Board of Agriculture against the proposals of this Bill they had not complete confidence in that Board in regard to the selection of a single arbiter. The records of the last few years showed instance after instance where the Board of Agriculture, not from any want of zeal or knowledge, but from the difficulty of acquainting themselves with local knowledge and adapting themselves to local conditions, had failed fully to appreciate what was required by this or that particular branch of farming in Scotland. To give to the new Commissioners the powers in regard to improvements in flocks and herds and in the conditions of farming and to withdraw from them the right to defend the health of those flocks and herds would be a most illogical proceeding. They took every precaution to defend health and sanitation in regard to individuals, and why should they neglect health and sanitation in regard to the flocks and herds of the country? The right hon. Gentleman said that the proposals of the Bill could not be carried out with safety, but it was impossible to maintain that position in argument or to show that the two Departments concerned would not be able to work in perfect harmony one with the other. The right hon. Gentleman had said that unity of control had been a great thing and that many reforms which he had in his mind could not have been carried out unless he had been master of the situation throughout the length and breadth of these islands. In carrying out some of those reforms it occurred to him that sufficient weight had not been paid to Scottith public opinion. If it was admitted, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite had admitted, that it was possible for the two Departments concerned to work in harmony and co-operate in carrying out the same legislative policy, a strong case was at once made out for a separate Department in Scotland to give full expression to the needs and wishes of Scotland in this matter. Scottish administration in all its Departments was in no way behind similar Departments in English administration. They had a Scottish Education Department and a Scottish Local Government Department, and their administration was not in any way behind the English Departments.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): I should say that the Local Government Board is.

MR. SINCLAIR said they would see whether that was so or not when the next Report was issued. He saw nothing but advantage to Scotland in the establishment of a Scottish Department of this kind. Fears had been expressed that this proposal might prove detrimental to flocks and herds, but he assured the House that that would not be the effect, and they would still cross the border. Scottish mutton would still come to the English market, because Englishmen wished to purchase it and Scotsmen would take care that nothing should take its place in the English market. The proposal made by the Government would help them to improve their place in the English markets and improve their flocks as well, and consequently it would be beneficial to both countries and to all parties concerned. In his opinion, to divide the powers of the Board of Agriculture as suggested would simply be to divide the responsibility and cause friction, which would lead to a weakening of the administration. At present they had only a subordinate Department in Scotland. The proposal of the Bill had been carefully considered and would be carefully carried out, and everything would be done to protect Scottish and English interests. It was no part of his case to criticise adversely the administration of the Board of Agriculture, and he had simply related the facts. That Board had been zealous and energetic, and they were grateful for its administration, but with its centre in London it was inevitable that its policy would be dominated to a much larger degree by English interests, and this proposal enabled Scotsmen to look after Scottish interests. The right hon. Gentleman was evidently influenced, and quite naturally, by the consideration of the usefulness of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and its *status*. He made no complaint of that, but he claimed that it was their duty to protect Scottish interests, and he had not been at all impressed by the Scottish opinion which had been quoted in favour of the view held by the right hon. Gentleman, which largely centred round the Chamber of Agriculture in Scotland. They were told that the opinion of the public bodies in Scotland deserved to be respected. His first impulse was to ask which opinion. A conference of the Chamber of Agriculture was held in October last year, three months after the Bill was introduced last session, and not a word was then said adverse to the proposals to which some of its members were now opposed. Some of the speakers who were now the loudest in condemnation of the Government proposals, for the past ten years had frequently given expression to opinions in favour of a separate Board of Agriculture. This agitation was one which had arisen on second thoughts. He asked the House to face the larger issues in the Bill before them. The Government were endeavouring to deal with evils which on all hands were admitted and were as great in

Scotland as in any other part of the United Kingdom. In order to stop the decay of rural life and physical deterioration they ought to make greater efforts to stay the progress of these evils, and to achieve this they required every opportunity which the Government could place in the hands of the people. They wanted the Board of Agriculture to help small holdings. He had argued that this was the main work of the Board of Agriculture, and therefore to take away this work from the Board would be to paralyse the organisation which the Government wished to set up in Scotland. The work of the Agricultural Commissioners would not be confined to the creation of small holdings; they were charged with the general duty of supervising agriculture in Scotland, and it was essential that they should have the powers which the right hon. Gentleman proposed should be withdrawn from them.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that he and his Scottish colleagues desired to protect the interests of Scotland. He (Mr. Lane-Fox) and his friends were there to protect the interests of England. He was an Englishman from the North of England and these matters affected agriculturists in that quarter considerably. There were strong reasons why they should wish to see the Board of Agriculture maintained as it was at present and that the change contemplated by the Bill should not be made. The Amendment only referred to the administration of the Diseases of Animals Acts. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken as if it affected the whole foundations of the question of small holdings in Scotland. Did he really think that the prosperity of the people who were going to become small holders depended entirely on the administration of the Diseases of Animals Acts? It seemed to Englishmen near the border that it was absolutely essential for the broad and proper administration of the Acts that the whole island should be included. It was obvious that there might be considerable danger to the herds in the North of England if some serious form of cattle plague were to break out in Scotland, where for reasons affecting the interests and convenience of Scotland the Board of Agriculture in that country, considering only themselves and disregarding the effect which their policy had in relation to English stock, pursued less stringent methods in the administration of the Diseases of Animals Acts. The interests of one part of the United Kingdom should not, for obvious reasons, be considered apart from the interests of the whole. There were a great many cases in which sheep and dogs came from Scotland to England. Regulations which might suit Scotland might be prejudicial to the interests of England. It would be said that the English Board of Agriculture could take steps to protect England, but still he thought it was desirable that the administration of the Acts should be effected by one body acting for the whole of the United Kingdom. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken in a derogatory manner of the action of the Board of Agriculture in relation to Scotland. He had referred to the friction which had resulted from the administration of the sheep dipping orders and other matters. He would point out that what the right hon. Gentleman had said applied not merely to Scotland, but to parts of England. There had been considerable friction in Yorkshire over the sheep dipping orders. It was absurd to suppose that every part of the United Kingdom was satisfied when the Board of Agriculture put regulations into force. There must be a burden on those to whom the restrictions were applied. If Scotland had a serious grievance against the Board of Agriculture it was obviously the duty of the Scottish Members to bring it before this House and to see that it was fairly dealt with. But to cut up the Board in the way proposed and to cripple its power would be, he was certain, a retrograde step. He believed if the right hon. Gentleman considered the effect of the proposal he would be ready to accept the new clause.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that the question under discussion affected English agriculture, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the position which he had taken up. The Board of Agriculture had been doing enormous good throughout the United Kingdom, and he was afraid the proposal now made by the Government would weaken it. The cattle brought from Scotland and sold in the markets of Carlisle and Berwick-on-Tweed would be under the regulations of the Scottish Board of Agriculture. If those regulations were to be different from those of the English Board there would be great trouble not only to Scottish farmers but to English salesmen. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman had stated any good reason for taking the power in this matter out of the hands of the Board of Agriculture. He had stated that it might be unpopular in Scotland, but the enforcement of these regulations was sure to be followed by unpopularity anywhere. In the case of swine fever, for instance, there were certain districts where the regulations in regard to that disease were very unpopular, but they were carried out in spite of their unpopularity. The Sheep Dipping Order was unpopular in Scotland, but if it had not been carried out by a body ruling over a large area there would have been a deadlock, and the enormous good which had resulted to sheep breeders would have been lost. The regulations as to diseases of cattle were always unpopular in certain areas, and therefore the larger the area under the control of the central body the better would be the administration of the Acts. A central body was not so likely to be moved from its purpose in the general interest by attacks from this or that part of the country. He hoped the powers under the Diseases of Animals half of the clause which gave these Acts would be retained by the central body.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said the Secretary for Scotland had stated that this subject had been freely discussed in the Standing Committee. His recollection was that that was not so. When exceptional powers to the Commissioners had been discussed, the rest of the clause was closured without any discussion at all. There was a conflict of opinion on this particular point, and to say that there had been adequate discussion was beside the mark. The attitude adopted by the right hon. Gentleman was thoroughly unsatisfactory. There would be serious danger if the existing restrictions on the importation of cattle were removed. The re-introduction of cattle plague would be a disastrous thing to British agriculturists. That being so, could there be any object in weakening the position of the Board of Agriculture? If there were separate boards representing England and Scotland, the Minister representing one might urge the Cabinet to adopt one course, while the Minister representing the other might advocate another course. They all knew that there was a considerable body of Scottish opinion in favour of removing the restrictions which at present existed in regard to Canadian cattle coming into this country. The Prime Minister had stated that he was in favour of these restrictions being removed. A good many feeders in Scotland were in favour of the restrictions being done away with. If the Board of Agriculture in Scotland removed the restrictions, it was obvious that the results might be most disastrous to English agriculturists. If the restrictions were removed in Scotland and not in England a gigantic system of supervision by inspectors along the border would be needed. Was it to be supposed that the agriculturists in the north of England were going to allow cattle to come from Scotland involving risk of contamination of the herds in England by cattle imported from Canada or elsewhere? Would rabies have been stamped out if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin had paid attention to the complaints which were written to him against the muzzling order by all the old women in the country who owned pet dogs? The more restrictions were enforced the more likely they were to stamp out the diseases against which they were aimed. The right hon. Gentleman had argued as if the Board of Agriculture in Scotland would in some way be insulted if this particular part of its duty were taken away from it, and left in the hands of the English Agricultural Department. The Scottish Board would have plenty of other things to do—the whole supervision of small holdings, and the granting of advice and assistance to small holders; but it would not have the power to prevent the flocks and herds of this country from being contaminated by imported disease in the absence of the strict regulations now enforced by the English Agricultural Board. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that it was absurd that the people of Scotland could be entrusted to look after the health of individuals and not after the health of flocks and herds. Could any one imagine a less complete analogy? It was preposterous that the same regulations or the same system of administration could in any way be applied to the health of individuals and the health of flocks and herds. He could not imagine, after all the pressure that had been put on the Government both outside and inside the House that they would be so short-sighted as not to accept the clause moved by the right hon. Gentleman, which was necessary if a Board of Agriculture was to be set up in Scotland without doing great injury to the English Agricultural Board.

*MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that as an agricultural Member, a supporter of the Government, and of the general objects which they had in view in introducing this Bill, he hoped that the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment. The United Kingdom had the advantage of being an island in which Scotland was included, and it was obvious that they would be in a far better position to deal with disease coming from abroad if the island was treated as a whole and effectual regulations were made to combat with any possible invasion of disease. The objects for which the new Agricultural Commissioners were to be appointed for Scotland would not be hindered if the matter of coping with cattle diseases were left out of the Bill. He hoped that the new clause proposed with so much force and supported by so many strong reasons would be accepted by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill.

MR. CHAPLIN (Surrey, Wimbledon) said that he was filled with apprehension at the proposal of the Secretary for Scotland, and all the more so that from beginning to end of his observations he had never once touched or approached the argument of his right hon. friend the Member for South Dublin. Indeed, the right hon. Gentleman had never tried to meet the case presented for the Amendment. What was the proposal? It was that —

> "Nothing contained in this Act or done in pursuance thereof shall prejudice, affect, or interfere with the sole exercise by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries of all powers and duties under the provisions and for the purposes of the Diseases of Animals Acts."

His right hon. friend had pointed out that the administration of the Diseases of Animals Acts under dual control might lead to serious consequences. The Secretary for Scotland thought he had met that argument by challenging his right hon. friend to say that it was not possible for the two boards to work in perfect harmony. He maintained that it was possible that they would not work in perfect harmony. And supposing that they did not, it might be possible for the Secretary for Scotland to admit animals from abroad contrary to the regulations that existed at the present time.

MR. SINCLAIR said that the admission of Canadian cattle to Scotland had been already alluded to; but there would be no change in that regard until Parliament had so determined.

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, but if the agricultural authority in Scotland on the one hand and the head of the English Agricultural Department on the other were in dispute, and if that dispute were submitted to a Cabinet presided over by the present Prime Minister, who before the last election strongly argued for the readmission of Canadian cattle into this country, what would be the position? A Bill would be introduced to carry out the Premier's views. That was what he was afraid of; and it would be done under a total misapprehension of the circumstances of the case. His right hon. friend had pointed out the great danger there was of the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into this country by Canadian cattle. He did not refer to cattle plague; he knew that there was no cattle plague in Canada. But he defied anyone to show that Canada, with its enormous extent of territory, its long frontier and its vast number of cattle, was free from pleuro-pneumonia at the present time. No inspection could guard against its readmission into this country. There was only one safeguard: the slaughter of the cattle at the port of entry. And for this reason; that pleuro-pneumonia was a disease that could not be detected in the living animal. It might lie dormant for months and years. These facts were known, and supposing that Canadian cattle were readmitted, nothing was more certain than that two or three years afterwards they would be confronted with an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia and the whole work of extirpation would have to be undertaken again. But granting that Canada was at present free from the disease, it was known to exist in the United States; and how was it possible, with a frontier of 6,000 miles, to prove that cattle suffering from pleuro-pneumonia did not cross the frontier from the United States into Canada? He could not think of anything more disastrous than that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman should become law. He believed that there was a small section of farmers in some parts of Scotland and a few farmers in one or two counties in England who desired the introduction of Canadian cattle, but these men were simply feeders of stock, whereas the people that should be encouraged and receive exceptional treatment were the breeders. Having in view the manifest dangers from the introduction of disease into this country and the enormous amount of time, labour, and money which had been spent a few years ago in getting rid of all disease amongst our flocks and herds, he trusted that the House would induce the Government to accept the Amendment of his right hon. friend. It would not interfere with the Board of Agriculture in Scotland in promoting the extension of small holdings or other matters but it would prevent the alteration of the laws and regulations as to cattle disease, which were of vital concern to the agricultural interest as a whole.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said that there was no question that the farmers of Scotland were practically unanimous in support of the new clause moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin. And the opinion of the farmers of Scotland upon this matter ought to be considered, because the great bulk of their capital was locked up in stock. It was only through their stock that they could hope to pursue their calling with success. There was no money in grain. He believed that with different regulations for Scotland and England, and two separate Boards of Agriculture, there would be a certain amount of trouble at the border, particularly at Dumfries, Carlisle, and Berwick-on-Tweed. The real reason that impelled the Scottish farmers to desire the continuance of the administration of the British Board of Agriculture in respect of cattle disease was to have security for the health of their flocks and herds, and there was no such security under the Bill. The new Scottish Board of Agriculture would cost between £25,000 and £30,000 a year. What was wanted in Scotland was a Board which would be subordinate to the British Board, but charged especially with the supervision of certain interests in Scotland. He did not think that any Scottish agriculturist would be prepared to accept a new Scottish Board up a two-pair back in Edinburgh in place of the Board in Whitehall.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said that as a Scottish Member he would like to join in the support which had been given to this clause. He could not quite understand the sequence of the right hon. Gentleman's logic which would place power in the hands of two Boards instead of one, and increase the burdens on the small agriculturists. The right hon. Gentleman had said that this was a question of administration on which Scotland had a right to have an opinion, and Scotland, no doubt, had a right to have her interests consulted. They were not afraid that Scottish Members would fail to see that the interests of their country were protected in that House without a Scottish Board in Scotland. The analogy set before them was that of education, but the right hon. Gentleman seemed to forget that the laws as to education in Scotland were 300 years older than the education laws in England. Again, hon. Gentlemen seemed to forget that there was more or less distinction between the transit of individual citizens from one part of the country to another and the transit of oxen and pigs. The duties of the Board of Agriculture were to prevent the dissemination of the diseases of animals from one part of the country to another, and this was an important point to safeguard. He did not see how these Commissioners were to take over these duties from the Board of Agriculture. The Commissioners, it appeared, were to be in effect independent of the Secretary for Scotland.

MR. SINCLAIR said that in the discharge of their duties the Agricultural Commissioners would comply with such instructions as might be issued by the Secretary for Scotland.

SIR HENRY CRAIK inquired if the right hon. Gentleman thought he was going to lay down rules under which he would keep these Commissioners in leading strings. He would find that they were susceptible of pressure from other Members of Parliament and from without, and that neither he nor his successors would be able to hold them in check. He thought they were entitled to some expression of opinion from the representative of the Board of Agriculture as to the views of his Department. There had been a correspondence with the Board of Agriculture, and the vast majority of the correspondents expressed their opinion that the Board of Agriculture was in touch with Scottish farmers. An immense majority, something like five-sixths, were in favour of the continuance of the authority of the Board of Agriculture in Scotland, and he hoped the hon. Baronet would not allow his Department to be stripped of the important authority which had worked well both for England and Scotland. This transfer of authorities was an excrescence, and without it he was sure the Bill might be carried through with advantage to Scotland.

*SIR J. DEWAR (Inverness) said that if the idea was to make the administration of Scotland more efficient he could not believe that the establishment of two Boards, one working partially and the other wholly in Scotland, would tend to efficiency. If the power to regulate the working of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts was in the hands of a Scottish Agricultural Department, the work, so far as the local arrangements were concerned, was bound to be more efficient. He thought it would be better to leave this matter in the hands of the Scottish Board of Agriculture than to have it managed from London. It would be a misfortune if the two Departments did not work amicably together, but being managed by sensible men having the same objects in view he saw no reason to believe that the most amicable relations would not exist.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the Secretary for Scotland was mistaken in thinking any discourtesy had been intended by interruptions from that bench. Their desire was simply that he should deal with the Amendment, which he had refrained from doing. Not one syllable which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman touched the substance and nerve of the argument advanced by the mover of the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman had asked why Scotland could not deal with cattle diseases, seeing that she had the responsibility of dealing with human diseases. They might properly leave to one part of the kingdom the regulation of public health—questions of sewers and sanitary regulations—because the interests of another partner in the United Kingdom were not involved. But responsibility in this matter could not be shared with the British Board of Agriculture without affecting profoundly the interests of English as well as Scottish agriculturists. There could not be a greater exposure of the fallacy that this was a Scottish and not an English Bill than the fact that they had had Members from both sides of the House debating it from the English point of view, seeing that England was profoundly interested in the cattle regulations. Moreover, if there was a difference of opinion, and disease was allowed to come into Scotland which England tried to keep out, Scotland would be isolated by regulations which would be ruinous to and destructive of Scottish agriculture. It had been suggested that two Ministers of common sense would not be likely to disagree in the matter.

As a matter of fact, common-sense men very often did disagree. In regard to rabies, they had seen the Irish Government establishing one set of regulations and the British Government another. The British Administration accordingly interposed a Customs barrier, as it were, to keep out Irish dogs, and Irish sportsmen who desired to bring over their dogs for sporting purposes were very bitter indeed. If the question were one not of sporting dogs, but of agricultural trade, the injury to agriculture on both sides of the border would be incalculable. Perhaps it would be said that the injury England could do Scotland by setting up this barrier was so great that in case of a difference of opinion the English Minister could coerce his Scottish brother into subservience. Would not that be a deplorable state of things? Scotland would possess independence in name. She would have it in reality, so far as friction and embarrassment mere concerned. But the one real advantage which was sought—that Scotland should be wholly independent of England in this matter—would not be attained. He appealed to the House on the broadest and plainest grounds of public policy. There was no case he knew of in which a common interest was administered by two different departments, and the exclusion of disease from these islands was a common interest. Let Scotland manage the many things which were purely local. The transmission of disease from the north to the south of the Tweed was not a Scottish question. It was common to England and Scotland. Microbes knew nothing of these national distinctions. They were profoundly indifferent to the artificial line which divided Great Britain into two parts. The question was one which the action of nature had made common to the whole of the island, and it was mere folly not to deal with it through one Minister. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken as if the Agricultural Commissioners could not carry out their work efficiently in connection with small holdings unless they performed this additional task. For his own part he could not see the connection between the two subjects.

*Mr. MOLTENO (Dumfriesshire) hoped the Government would adhere to their proposal. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that disease was a common danger coming from outside, and that a common interest ought to be dealt with by a common authority. But judging of the present state of things by that argument, what did they find? They found that England had a Local Government Board and that Scotland had a Local Government Board, who had as a matter of fact been perfectly able to deal separately with cholera and plague that had threatened our doors for years past. It seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman had very much exaggerated this question of disease. In fact there seemed to lurk in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite the idea that Scotland was a very backward country, and that they would not be able to guard against this danger of disease. But Scotland had as varied an agriculture as England; she had a large number of breeders of cattle, and her interest in keeping free from disease was as great as that of England, indeed it was greater because she exported cattle. It was a very interesting fact that while in Great Britain we had been unable to stamp out swine fever, in Denmark, where they had a very active Government which took a great interest in agriculture, they had been able to stamp it out entirely. He trusted they would be as successful in Scotland. He hoped that hon. Members on his side of the House would not be led away with the idea that in Scotland in a matter of this kind they were unable to look after their own affairs. If they got the powers proposed they would be as capable of discharging the duties thrown upon them as were the authorities in England.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said the hon. Member had pointed out that they had got rid of swine fever in Denmark. To what was that due? It was due to the fact that Denmark was under one comprehensive authority. The hon. Gentleman had also said that they bred as valuable cattle in Scotland as in England. Would the hon. Member refer him to a single breeder in Scotland who would support him in opposing this Amendment? Out of every 100 breeders of cattle in Scotland, seventy-five were opposed to the Government's proposal. He went further, and said that out of every £1,000 worth of capital invested in Scotland in stock the owners of £750 of it would vote for this Amendment, and against the Government. He thanked the hon. Member for the arguments he had adduced. This question was extremely interesting to those who sat on the Scottish Grand Committee, and the Prime Minister would now recognise, after nearly two hours discussion, that the points which arose under the Bill touched vitally the interests of England, and the right hon. Gentleman would not be quite so surprised as he had been that the measure should have taken such a considerable time to discuss in Committee upstairs. He believed agriculturists in England and Scotland agreed with him in deprecating and regretting the tendency to establish separate authorities for agriculture in the two countries. The agricultural interests of this island were neither English nor Scottish; they were absolutely British; they were absolutely identical, and the endeavour to split the governing power into two was hostile to the interests of both, and, in certain circumstances, absolutely fatal. The hon. Baronet who sat opposite to him, and with whom he had broken a lance or two in Committee, had asked why should they not leave Scotland to take its own precautions against disease. The hon. Baronet must remember that all Scotsmen did not live in Inverness-shire, and that some Scotsmen lived towards the south of that country, some with agricultural interests conducted pretty close on the Border. If there came an outbreak of swine fever, under the existing method of dealing with that disease they must draw a cordon, and in all probability it would have to be drawn on this side of the Border. How would the hon. Member's idea act then? Before they could act they would have to get the consent of the new authority in Scotland, and also the consent of the authority in England, in order that simultaneous measures might be taken to protect both countries. Every one concerned with this industry knew, as he was sorry to say he knew, that rapidity of action in dealing with the disease was essential. If they had the delay of getting the consent of the two authorities the disease would in the meantime be allowed to go rampant, and infinite harm and mischief would be done. He thought the whole of the arguments of those who opposed the Government, as well as of those who professed to support it, ran in one direction, namely, that in this instance the Government was making a blunder, and that it would be well advised in listening to the great bulk of the agricultural opinion both in Scotland and in England. Of those who had spoken three supporters of the Government who were conversant with agricultural matters were in favour of the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill knew well that if he left this question to a ballot, those concerned with agriculture in Scotland would not give him one vote out of 100. The right hon. Gentleman shook his head. Well, he would say that he would not get more than two out of 100, and the Secretary for Scotland knew quite well that two out of 100 would be the maximum he would obtain; he would be beaten to pieces by the votes of the vast majority of agriculturists in Scotland. By this Bill the right hon. Gentleman would to a certain extent be injuring the confidence of Scottish agriculturists in the safety of their well-bred stock. There was one other point which became subject matter of this Bill. They were trying to set up small holdings, and to encourage the smallholders to breed stock in proportion to their acreage. But once any disease was admitted into that country the smallholder would be ruined, even if it did not ruin the big breeders. The small holder could not afford to risk losing one of his cattle, nor being cut off from the markets, as he would have to be if there were disease. Therefore, by this measure they would endanger at the outset the interests of the smallholders they were attempting to create. The Leader of the Opposition had pointed ou how absurd the situation would be when if disease were admitted, a cordon had immediately to be established on the frontier. Hon. Gentlemen found fault with their talking of Scotland as if all the stupidity was on one side and none on the other. But he would put it the other way, that all the stupidity was on the side of England and none on the side of Scotland. How would that add to the security of Scotland from disease? They were going to force upon the agriculturists of Scotland a system which they did not want, and nothing would be more welcome to them than to know that the Government had listened to the arguments urged from both sides of the House and had accepted this new clause.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 120; Noes, 176. (Division List No. 377.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil,Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Ffrench, Peter
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Glover, Thomas
Gordon, J.
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Long, RtHnWalter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts,S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shackleton, David James
Sheffield,SirBerkeley GeorgeD.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Snowden, P.
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walsh, Stephen
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Bellairs, Carylon
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex, Romf'rd
Black, Arthur W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon T. A.
Branch James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Buchanan Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirW.J.(St.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh

Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Duckworth, James
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,RtHn.SirW.Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, E. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scrboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn. A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthn
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon.

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Mr. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.), in moving an Amendment to secure purchase by agreement, explained that he did so to clear up the point as to whether a small holding was always to remain a small holding, or whether there was any power to renounce the small holding in a similar manner as could be done at the present time. A crofter could now renounce his holding under Section 7 of the Crofters Act, and it then ceased to be a small holding under Section 34, because the words were "any piece of land held by a crofter." If it was not held by a crofter, it ceased to be a croft. He understood that Section 34 had been repealed. He wished to know whether the landlord who wished to sell his land to the landholder could do so under this Bill. The landlord might let under certain conditions, but there was nothing said about the power to purchase or sell the small holding. In any case it was desirable in the interests of both the landlord and the landholder that the latter should be able to become the possessor of the land by purchase. If words were not put in to enable the landholder to purchase, the landlord, although willing to sell, might not be able to give a proper and clear title to the landholder. It was unnecessary to argue this point at any length. He believed there was a great desire in Scotland to own land, and many of them would not be satisfied with merely paying rent. That desire existed and he wanted it made clear that it could be met.

New clause—

"When the landlord of a holding has agreed to sell such holding to the landholder in occupation thereof, it shall be lawful for the landlord or the landholder to apply to the Land Court to register the sale of such holding, and the Land Court shall thereafter determine and by order declare such holding to have ceased to be a holding within the meaning of this Act."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. SINCLAIR said that when the hon. Member raised this question in Committee he made a promise that it should be considered. There was not the slightest desire to stand in the way of a sale to the landholder, and he agreed that facilities should be given and no obstacles should be placed in the way of such a sale. It was evident in the Committee that a fear existed that this was not provided for. He had considered the point with such assistance as his learned friend had been able to give him, and they had concluded that there was no obstacle in the Bill against the sale to a landholder of his holding. If the hon. Member would refer to page 50 of the Amendment Paper he would see that the Government had put down an Amendment to Clause 16 as follows—

"In line 14, at end, to insert the words 'but nothing in this proviso contained shall apply to the case of a holding ceasing to be held by a landholder by reason of resumption by the landlord or by reason of the sale of the holding to the landholder.'"

He was advised that it was not necessary to put in anything more to affirm the point raised by the hon. Member.

MR. COCHRANE said that no doubt the right hon. Gentleman had been well advised, and if he was satisfied that the point he had raised was covered he begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs), in moving a new clause referring to forfeiture of tenancy on failure of bequest or non-acceptance by legatee, said he did not propose to make a speech. He simply wished to know what the right hon. Gentleman's view was in regard to accepting it. He begged to move.

New clause—

"Where, owing to the failure of the landholder to bequeath his tenancy or of the legatee to accept the bequest, the right of the tenancy devolves upon the heir-at-law of the landholder, the landlord may give notice in writing to such heir requiring him to state whether or not he elects to accept the tenancy, and in case such heir shall not, within six weeks after the receipt of such notice, declare that he elects to accept the tenancy the tenancy shall be forfeited: provided that if such heir be furth of the United Kingdom the Land Court may grant such extension of the period hereinbefore specified as may seem to them to be reasonable."—(*Mr. Younger.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. SINCLAIR said this clause stood in the same category as the one which was discussed in Committee and which the Government promised to consider. There was some reason to think that this clause would be a bad one for the landlord. The words in line 7, were "the tenancy shall be forfeited." The Government could not accept those words and the proposal would have to be modified in some way. Apart from that consideration, it seemed to him that this was rather a bad clause for the landlord. It rather tied his hands. He thought a little more consideration should be given to the clause by the hon. Member before he pressed it. It was open to serious objection, because it suggested more rigid procedure than was necessary. As at present advised he was unable to accept the clause on behalf of the Government.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said the general opinion when this clause was discussed in Committee was that it was necessary. If the heir-at-law was unknown a certain period might elapse before he could be discovered. When discovered it might be found that he was a tradesman who did not want to take the farm, but if he thought there was some profit to be made out of it he might refuse to say what he was going to do. In the meantime the land would be going to ruin. There was no provision in the Bill for the cultivation of the holding while the heir-at-law was being found. The new clause provided that the landlord might find out who the heir-at-law was, ask him to say at once whether he was going to take the holding or not, and, in the event of his refusing, come in and take possession of the holding. He failed to see how the new clause would hinder the creation of small holders. He thought his hon. friend should press this matter to a division unless the Solicitor-General for Scotland could show that the case he had put to the House was not likely to occur.

MR. YOUNGER expressed regret that the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to accept the clause. The clause had been carefully drafted and had received the greatest consideration from a very competent authority. It was purely permissive, and he did not think it would tie the landlords' hands in the way the right hon. Gentleman had suggested. If the right hon. Gentleman thought the penalty of forfeiture was too severe, other words might be introduced.

MR. SINCLAIR suggested that in substitution for the words "the tenancy shall be forfeited" the words "his rights in the tenancy shall pass to the next heir, and the same procedure shall apply."

MR. YOUNGER said that that was better than nothing, but there were so many possible heirs in a Scottish glen that it might be difficult to find the next heir.

MR. SINCLAIR said he was not at all anxious to accept the clause in that form. He only made the suggestion for the purpose of facilitating business.

MR. WALTER LONG said the suggestion of the Secretary for Scotland was better than nothing, and he would advise his hon. friend to accept it. It would be quite just to cast upon the next heir the obligation of coming forward and claiming his property within a reasonable time. Six weeks had been suggested, but it might be desirable to extend that period. If there were a variety of possible heirs in the Scottish glens this Bill might afford the possibility of settling the difficulty as in days gone by. The policy of the Government might serve to revive some of those interesting scenes which they thought were ended for ever.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 7 to leave out the words 'the tenancy shall be forfeited' and insert the words 'his rights in the tenancy shall pass to the next heir, and the same procedure shall apply.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, added to the Bill.

New clause—

"If a landholder either renounces or is removed from his holding while owing any arrears of rent to the landlord, the landlord shall be entitled to set off such arrears of rent, and also the rent of the outgoing crop, against any sum found to be due to the landholder or to the Agricultural Commissioners for improvements made on the holding."—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. URE, Linlithgowshire) said the Government would accept the clause.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added to the Bill.

Clause 1:—

MR. WALTER LONG moved to leave out the words "and shall have effect throughout Scotland." He said the clause sought to apply the Crofters Acts generally throughout Scotland. In dealing with the question of small holdings, the Government in their wisdom had decided to take the Crofters Acts as their foundation. The question of applying these Acts generally was discussed at great length in the Standing Committee. The Secretary for Scotland told the Committee that the Acts had been an unqualified success, and that their success was the reason why the Government had adopted this procedure. On the other hand it had been argued that their success had been only partial, and that they were not in themselves suitable for application throughout Scotland. There was one great objection to the application of the Crofters Acts outside a special area. The Crofters Acts had had the effect of giving the crofting tenants certain advantages in regard to tenure which were no doubt justified in their case. But none the less it was obvious that the policy which the Government had adopted would unquestionably extend the principle of dual ownership in those districts where there was not the same foundation for it as in the crofting areas, and where the operation of that system would be impossible. Experience had shown that they were compelled ultimately to buy out the landlord, and so get rid of that party whose interest had become the smallest in the property. It was admitted that the crofters were unwilling to become owners of their crofts, but that was because the alterations in the local charges fell upon the crofting owner. Under the Crofters Act they had to provide machinery suitable to the needs of the crofters and recognising their just demands; therefore the crofters did not want to be turned from occupiers to owners. But that could not be said of the districts to which they were going to apply this Bill. Legislation which had been successful in a particular district under certain conditions could not be successful in an area where the conditions were totally different. It was impossible to avoid a passing reference to the fact that it was proposed by the Government to deal with the same subject in totally different ways in two different parts of the same country. There was no difference between the conditions of tenancy of small holdings in Scotland and in England. They found the same class of men, carrying on their industry in the same way and under conditions exactly similar. The conditions of the English small holder were entirely ignored by the Government who sought to apply a hard and fast rule to a new class of tenants in Scotland, which he and those who agreed with him believed would break down. It had been said that as the Crofters Act had been so successful in the Highlands it would be equally successful in other parts of the country. That was the argument of the master of Dotheboys Hall in administering physic. As one kind of physic had been found to be useful in the case of one boy it was administered all round whether it was suitable to their little stomachs or not. What the Government were doing was to apply to the whole of Scotland principles and practice which had been a success in districts where very different conditions prevailed. It was in order to raise this question at the earliest possible moment that he had put down this Amendment. He admitted that if the Amendment were accepted it would be necessary to provide machinery to work it. He trusted that they would hear from the Government a rather fuller justification for Clause 1 than they had heard upstairs, and that after time and reflection had been given them they had come to the conclusion to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 8 and 9, to leave out the words 'and shall have effect throughout Scotland.' "—(*Mr. Long.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. URE said that the right hon. Gentleman could scarcely expect the Government to accept this Amendment, because it struck at the very root of the measure. The proposal of the Bill was that the principle of the Crofters Act should be applied to existing holdings in all the counties of Scotland. What was the essence of the Crofters Act? It was to confer security of tenure on the crofters. A fair rent court was absolutely essential if they were to have security of tenure. They all knew what would happen without security of tenure and the fixing of a fair rent. If a landlord desired to get rid of a tenant who had become obnoxious to him, he had only to raise the rent of that undesirable tenant to an amount which it was impossible for the tenant to pay. The Bill did nothing more for existing holdings than give the small holder security of tenure. It thus destroyed the landlord's power of arbitrary eviction. That was the whole length to which the Bill went. The right hon. Gentleman had insisted that the Government should give a full explanation as to the extent of the benefit which would be conferred on small holders in the south of Scotland if the Crofters Acts were extended to them. But it would be in the recollection of the right hon. Gentleman that this matter was discussed for the best part of three days in Committee upstairs, and it constituted the gist of his speech on the Second Reading. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Leith moved in Committee did not touch the question of new holdings, and it was an Amendment on which the two sides of the House had joined issue. The right hon. Gentleman had said that a land system adapted for the Highlands would not be suitable to all parts of Scotland. He had never heard a single argument from any hon. Member opposite in support of the view that if security of tenure was desirable in the Highlands it would be a misfortune in the Lowlands. The right hon. Gentleman had said that in one particular only had the Crofters Act been successful and that that had been the result of the willingness on the part of the crofters to continue as tenants and not as owners. He agreed. And why? It was because of the question of rates. The right hon. Gentleman knew well that when a crofter became the owner of his croft he was rated at once not only on the value of his land but on the value of the buildings on the land. But as long as he remained a tenant, both he and the landlord were only rated on the value of the land. Nobody had said why security of tenure was not desirable to the man who had not made his own improvements. If he had not erected the buildings he paid a rent to the landlord who had. The Government believed that security of tenure would be for the benefit of agriculture whether in the Highlands or the Lowlands, and that was their justification for this Bill and their reason for resisting the Amendment.

MR. MUNRO-FERGUSON said they had heard some arguments in support of this clause, but he would be the last to say that those arguments could not be answered, and as reasons were originally given for the Crofters Act and for restricting it to the crofter area some reasons should now be given for the reversal of that policy and for the extension of the crofter provisions to the whole of Scotland. He thought that some of the reasons which had been given afforded an excellent ground for confining the operation of the Act to the crofting districts. The distinction which the Solicitor-General for Scotland could not see between the property invested in land and the property invested in equipment was, he thought, extremely obvious. Let them take a case in which a landlord appropriated the amount which the tenant invested in equipment: it amounted to misappropriation, because the only right the owner had was to the land and the use of it by means of his capital, but the only ultimate security an owner had for the investment of capital in the holding was in the right to select the man who had the use of that capital. Of that security he was absolutely deprived by the Bill. The Solicitor-General for Scotland has shown a marvellous verbal dexterity in dealing with this measure, but he had not convinced anyone who had anything to do with practical agriculture. Divided ownership was not an inducement to invest capital in the equipment of holdings, and the deterioration of agricultural equipment was assured under the Bill. It had been said that it would be all right if the occupier found the equipment; but he did not do so, and what he thought was that the existing sitting tenant occupiers would look to the Government to find money to equip their holdings in exactly the same way as the new holders were to have their holdings equipped by advances from the State. This would land the State into the equipment of land which was at present farmed without any cost to the State. There was nothing in this clause to provide for the increased prosperity of the small farmers of Scotland, and if they reduced the necessity for agricultural equipment by the landlords they would reduce the number of small farmers. They were told by the Secretary for Scotland that the mind of the country was behind this Bill. He would like to know on what that opinion was based, because it appeared to be founded on absolutely no inquiry and was in the teeth of the Reports of the Housing Committee, of the Small Holdings Committee, and of agricultural experts. The agricultural experts in Scotland were practically unanimous against this Bill and against the extension proposed by this clause, and he believed the extension of the Crofters Act to the whole of Scotland would be disastrous to the agricultural interests of Scotland. At all events they must not take it that this extension of the Crofters Act was in any way supported by a majority in Scotland. One of the disadvantages of the system was that there was no clear line of demarcation between the men who made their own improvements and set up their own houses and who had a claim for valuation in consequence and those who did not. That was in his opinion a clear dividing line which ought to be adopted. Under this Bill, however, they might have a holding of 500 or even up to [illegible] acres in the district, but they could not make a distinction between a 52 acre dairy farm on the one side and those farms on the other. In that way they would block the path of progress in the future and the division of land into small farms for intensive cultivation. The Solicitor-General for Scotland had dealt with this question from a wholly wrong point of view. If they extended the Act to Scotland generally the injustice created would be rendered much more acute than by anything that had occurred up to the present time. They had not heard any reason why the Crofters Act should be extended to the whole of Scotland. They thought it would be disastrous to the agricultural interests of Scotland and therefore he cordially supported the proposal that it should not be so extended.

Mr. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.) said the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs had described the Crofters Act as a colossal failure.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON said the hon. Member for South Edinburgh was in the habit of putting very strong expressions into his mouth. In the Committee the hon. Gentleman had put into his mouth the word "criminal" and now he put into his mouth the word "colossal," a word which he had not used. What he said was that it had been a qualified success.

Mr. A. DEWAR said he did not accuse the hon. Member of using the word "colossal," he used the word himself. The hon. Member now said the Crofters Act was a qualified success. He would start from that point, and his first observation was that he had read with great care the debate which took place in this House in 1886, and the predictions then made by the front Opposition bench were that the Act would prove a dismal failure. Hon. and right hon. Members opposite were now prepared to admit that it had been a qualified success. Those who knew the condition of Scotland in 1885 and who travelled through it and saw the condition now would see how great a change had taken place. The Highlands of Scotland in 1885 were in a state of incipient rebellion, and the Government were obliged to do something to mitigate the evils then existing, and they introduced the Crofters Act. That Act gave, in the first place, fixity of tenure so that the homes of these people might be for ever their own; it gave, in the second place, fair rent. That was all the Act did and the incipient rebellion faded out. The Highlands of Scotland were now the most peaceful part of the country. The people there were not now in a state of starvation, they were prosperous through agriculture. They had not now the miserable buildings they had in 1885. Some, it was true, might be there yet, because everything could not be done at once, but everyone who knew the country would admit that the face of the Highlands had altogether changed in this respect. There had not been a copper of the money of the landlords spent upon those buildings. The hon. Member for Leith Burghs spoke of the deterioration of the buildings, but admitted that the buildings in the Highlands had been improved. They had been improved out of the pockets of the people themselves. The Crofters Act had done an immense amount of good even as a comparative success. Why could it not do the same in the Lowlands? Were fixity of tenure, a good home, and a fair rent more valuable in the north than in the south? Were they to have one law for the hills and another for the plains? [AN HON. MEMBER: And England?] England was not so far advanced in this matter as Scotland and demanded a different measure. If England would not come abreast of Scotland, Scotland was not compelled to bring her. Scotland had been testing the thing for twenty-six years and knew exactly where she was. He had made a very diligent search through *Hansard* for the year 1886 and found some very interesting information. The general opinion of the Opposition then was that the Crofters Bill might do well in the Lowlands, where the soil was good, but that it would never do in the Highlands owing to the poverty of the soil and the inclement weather. The mover of the Opposition Resolution on that occasion said the right hon. Gentleman had shrunk from introducing a measure of this nature for the whole of Scotland; that if it was a good measure there was a strong reason for applying it to the whole of Scotland, and that he could not see on what ground it could be refused. He had numbers of extracts, but perhaps the best was that from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who now represented Wimbledon, who said that if such systems were to be tried let them in God's name be tried where they had some prospect of success and not in parts of the country where miserable and starving people already existed, where the soil was sterile and the climate inhospitable. That was the argument of those who now were against the extension of these provisions to the Lowlands. It was then said that the crofters had to live there and contend with inclement skies and a hungry soil. But they were living there now under far better conditions than ever before, and he attributed it to the Crofters Act. [A Voice: To spade labour.] To spade labour in parts and to some extent to fishing. The right hon. Gentleman on that occasion went on to say that while these people had not capital for their present holdings how much less would they have for the holdings it was proposed to confer upon them. They had found the capital and their buildings were in a far better condition than before. The right hon. Gentleman went on to state that whatever else the Bill would do it would dry up every source of prosperity, from that time forward the money would no longer be forthcoming and the stream from which it came would be dried up. That was the prophecy of twenty-one years ago. It looked particularly foolish at this date. Surely they might trust absolutely a Liberal Government, which was able to see so much farther and so much more clearly than hon. Gentlemen opposite, to know what Scotland felt in this matter. What was the difference between men north of the Grampians and men south of the Grampians? He had listened very carefully to try and discover that, but had not succeeded. He asked English Members who were not familiar with the Crofters Act to take it from him that that Act had been a success and that the crofters were looking and longing for this measure. The crofters were sore afraid that the landlords would throw out the Bill, but Scotland wanted it. If anyone asked for evidence of that it was to be found in the Scottish Members who supported the Government. The hon. Member for Leith Burghs stood alone among Scottish Liberal Members in opposing the Bill. He agreed that chambers of agriculture and the large farmers were likely to be against the Bill, but everybody else in Scotland, the small holders and the labourers, were not only in its favour, but were anxiously and earnestly awaiting it. He hoped they were not going to be disappointed, as it would be a serious blow to Scotland if they were. Eighty or 100 years ago land tenure was changed in Denmark, and the change was followed by prosperity. [Cries of "Purchase."] His point was that in the Highlands of Scotland they were getting security without the necessity for purchase, and they were getting that security with fairness to the landlords, because the landlords in the Highlands of Scotland were satisfied. He apologised for the digression, and thanked the House for the patience with which they had listened to him. He hoped English Members would support the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had listened to the hon. Gentleman, who had made a serious attempt to defend the position of the Bill, and in so doing he greatly differed from the only member of the Government who had as yet spoken on the Amendment. In the first place, he appeared to have forgotten, and in this he faithfully followed the Front Bench, all the principles that had animated the Government which originally brought in the Crofters Act. He appeared to have forgotten all the principles on which Mr. Gladstone founded his land legislation of 1882, or on which the Crofters Act of 1886 was based. It seemed to him that the Solicitor-General for Scotland thought it obvious that, if by this system of land tenure under the Crofters Act prosperity was given to the Highlands, they were justified by the mere fact of its success in the area where it prevailed in extending it, and that no further argument was required. That kind of statement must have been made in absolute ignorance or oblivion of the whole basis on which Mr. Gladstone had proceeded in dealing with Irish and with Highland land. Their ground was that in those countries they could hardly avoid inequity, or only avoid it, at all events, with the good will of the landlord, unless they established dual ownership, because in fact moral dual ownership existed already. They had said, not once but over and over again, that if the occupier of the soil was a man who had not merely put into it manure, not merely the things for which the occupier in England or the Lowlands paid, but had erected the permanent buildings, and made the permanent improvements, he at all events had an interest in the soil as great and as permanent as, perhaps greater, and in a sense almost more permanent than, had the owner of the soil himself. That was the argument with which they had to deal—they had to make the law a reflection of the facts, and they endeavoured to do so by establishing in the Highlands of Scotland and in Ireland a system of dual ownership, the evils of which were universally recognised until the present Government came into office eighteen months ago. The evils of dual ownership were recognised, but the evils of single ownership in the landlord were the basis of difficulty in the Highlands. Mr. Gladstone tried to cure that by saying—"If there is dual ownership in fact, let us give it in law." The result of dual ownership in Ireland, irrespective of party, was that everyone wanted single ownership in the place of dual ownership, but it was to be the single ownership, not of the landlord, but of the tenant, the man who had made the permanent improvements of the soil; and it was to that ideal that all men were now struggling in the sister island. Deaf to experience, blind to the plainest experiments going on before their eyes, oblivious of what was taking place on the Continent, hon. Gentlemen opposite desired to extend the system of dual ownership from parts where there was an equitable basis to parts of the country where there was no equitable basis. Instead of trying to create a body of small holders such as existed in Denmark and France, they wished to multipy these hybrid crofters, who were neither landlords nor tenants, who were carrying on a system which had neither all the advantages of the landlord system, because capital was not supplied by the landlord, nor all the advantages of the tenant system, because under the tenant system a man could deal with his holding with a far smaller capital than he could with a farm of which he had the advantage of ownership. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the system in the Highlands had all the advantages of ownership, because it conveyed security of tenure, which was the essence of ownership. He thought the hon. and learned Gentleman was wrong. He did not at all deny that security of tenure was one of the great elements of ownership, at all events until the Government began to interfere with certain forms of ownership in the high-handed manner with which they were becoming familiar. But it was really not the case that human beings were so constituted that they regarded land of which they were only the tenants precisely in the same light as they would look upon that same land were they the absolute owners. That was not the way human nature was constituted, and if it were true—as it was true—that in the Highlands of Scotland there was not the same desire to purchase the holding as existed in Ireland, it was because they had got in those parts of the Highlands a system of rating so preposterous and absurd that it would be very difficult to explain it to English Members in a speech made on an occasion such as the present. But the result was that in the Highlands they threw the whole of the new burden on the purchasers, which the purchasers were not willing to undertake. They would deprive them of any wish for ownership, and, wherever that was done, they lost one of the greatest motives, one of the strongest springs of action which could animate the human mind to make great sacrifices in improving that plot of land which was one's own. It was from that feeling, and from the existing system which they wished to destroy, that they extracted from the landowners of Scotland about £2,000,000 a year, or whatever the sum might be, which the landowners in Scotland, like the small landlords in Denmark, felt a pride in expending, were the holding five acres, 5,000 acres or 50,000 acres. They felt a pride in the estates which they possessed, and they were prepared to invest money, they were prepared to make sacrifices, in order that the properties for which they were responsible should be properties of which the most was made. It was as everybody knew, this motive which animated not merely whole communities, but all men who owned agricultural land, whether the quantity owned was small or big. By the system the Government were proposing they were going to deprive these people of that which was one of the greatest and most effective motives which could induce people, in these days of keen and increasing foreign competition, still to go on investing vast sums of money in preventing the rural districts from falling out of cultivation. He thought it was a most unwise and suicidal course. They were told that the Crofters Acts had been a success in the Highlands. Let him remind the House of what he took to be the real meaning of that part of the problem. Undoubtedly, in so far as they had given security of tenure to these small holders who had made their own improvements, they had done a certain amount of good, and, in some parts of the country, he thought a great deal of good; but when they were told, as they had been told by the Solicitor-General, that, in all the regions where the Crofters Act was in force, there they found flourishing buildings, a flourishing peasantry, rapidly growing prosperity, and absolute obedience to the law, that was not the account he got from Lewis and the Western Highlands. He believed there were parts of the country where they could not enforce the law, and he believed there were parts of the country where the crofters had seized land to which they had not the smallest right.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): I ask the right hon. Gentleman to specify those parts of the country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman has not the slightest right to interrupt me in that sort of way.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: I am exceedingly sorry.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman is not entitled to interrupt except to make some explanation. If the Leader of the Opposition gives way, the right hon. Gentleman is then entitled to intervene in the debate, but the right hon. Gentleman who is in possession of the House is not obliged to give way except on a point of order being raised.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that I meant no discourtesy. I was slightly embarrassed for the moment by the fact that the Minister for whom my observations were intended was absent, and that I was interrupted in the course of my speech by the right hon. Gentleman to whom I was not addressing my observations. If the right hon. Gentleman has an answer to what I state, however, I gladly give way.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman He will understand the very responsible position I occupy. It rests with me to maintain order in Scotland, and when the right hon. Gentleman makes a serious statement of that kind in regard to my country, that there is non-obedience to the law, I respectfully submit to him that he should furnish me with some information.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not object to do that, but he was not a Minister of the Crown, furnished with information; he could only speak from hearsay. Were there no difficulties in Barra?

Mr. THOMAS SHAW: So far as the enforcement of the law goes there are no difficulties whatever.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I think it would be better to follow the usual course and allow the right hon. Gentleman to complete his observations.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was informed that the crofters or inhabitants had occupied lands to which they were not entitled, that it was practically impossible for the owner of the land to resume possession, and that there was no legal machinery available for carrying out that object. If the right hon. Gentleman was able to give full and satisfactory information on that point he supposed he would do so. The Solicitor-General had quoted from a speech of his delivered in 1886, in which he pointed out that, if these people were really in the wretched position which was represented, they could not in a climate like the Highland West of Scotland become prosperous merely by giving them security of tenure. The right hon. and learned Gentleman thought that that prophecy had been disproved by the fact that houses had been built. Whether the houses in the extreme West of Scotland were good or not he did not know. But this was quite certain, that if these people really had built out of their resources since 1886 new farm buildings and new houses, and re-equipped the whole place, the system of tenure under which they lived before 1886 was one which permitted them to accumulate money. That was an unanswerable proposition. The mere waving of a legislative wand would not create capital where it did not exist before. Where the Crofters Act had been a success it had called out on the part of the tenant, with or without external assistance, a vast expenditure in the shape of permanent improvements which would not otherwise have been made. The landlord was not in the habit of making them, and the tenants could not make them if they were too poor, and would not make them if they had capital in the absence of fixity of tenure. We gave them fixity of tenure, and the capital was expended. The only result of extending the system from the Highlands to the Lowlands would be to dry up a great source of the expenditure which now went on. Was it not to the advantage of Scotland that the landowning interest outside the Highlands regarded it as a duty to equip the farms on their estates? By that means the sum of between £1,000,000 and £2,000,000 was annually invested in the land in Scotland, where it was well known that the equipment of farms was far in advance of what was to be found in England. This practice the Government were going to stop, at all events so far as small holdings were concerned. Why should Parliament put on the shoulders of the taxpayers a duty which the landlords were prepared to carry? How could they avoid that? By a subsequent clause in the Bill they were going to provide a very inadequate sum for equipping the new small holdings. Did they think that the tenants on the old small holdings were going to see the duty of equipping them placed upon their shoulders while the new holders were to be equipped at the cost of the State? The Bill was merely a transition measure by which they would transfer a large part of the burden of equipping the small holders in the non-Highland parts of Scotland from the shoulders of the owners who were at present ready to bear it to the shoulders of the general taxpayer. That was perfect folly. He quite sympathised with those who desired to substitute for the big landowners of this country a large number of small holders. That he could understand; but when they found a system which extracted from the landowners large sums of money for the equipment of their holdings he could not understand why they should deliberately throw away those advantages and transfer those burdens directly or indirectly to the shoulders of the general taxpayer.

He thought that was very stupid, and he questioned whether it was not also immoral. Mr. Gladstone, in dealing with Ireland, was so convinced of the inequity of applying the system of dual ownership, fixity of tenure, and fair rents to land where the owner provided all the capital that he drew a distinction between ordinary Irish tenancies and English managed estates. He believed that was the theory which underlay the rather confused utterances by which the Crofters Act was defended. In introducing the Crofters Act, Sir George Trevelyan said—

> "The crofters' holdings in Scotland were not like those in England; they were not equipped by the landlord with all that made them fit for cultivation. The improvements in their holdings had been made by the crofters themselves and there was nothing but a sense of duty to prevent the landlords getting rid of his tenants and appropriating his improvements."

That was one of the great justifications of the Crofters Act. It was now proposed to extend that Act from the part of the country where it was justified by special circumstances to other parts of the country where not a single condition was identical. The Solicitor-General had asked whether security for a house was less valuable in the Lowlands than in the Highlands. Was security for a house less valuable in England than in Scotland? England, it had been said, was not prepared for this Bill, and Scotland was. Was that the view of the Government? Was it the view of the right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the English Bill? From whatever point of view one looked at the extension of the Crofters Act to the Lowlands of Scotland, it was indefensible. He supported the Amendment with a whole-hearted agreement. He believed that the subsection was fundamentally bad. and he awaited with interest something in the nature of a serious attempt to make a defence of the proposition now being contested.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said there had been events in Scotland over which he would gladly have had the veil of comparative secrecy still rest, but that veil had unfortunately been drawn back by the right hon. Gentleman who had attacked the administration of the office which he himself had the honour to hold. He thought, therefore, it was due to the House that he should state exactly the position of matters. In the whole of the jurisdiction over which his rule as Lord Advocate extended there had been absolute peace except in one small portion of the Highlands, the Island of Barra, owned by one proprietor who was unfortunate in his relations with the tenantry. What the tenants of Barra longed for was land with security of tenure, and more land where their plots were too small. In fact they wanted new holdings carved out, and the small holdings a little enlarged. These poor tenants of Barra stepped across to the Island of Watersay and on the shore they planted a few potatoes, hoping to return in the spring to reap what little crop there was. To the best of his recollection that was the terrible offence which was committed. They were interfering with no human soul; they were treating that land as practically barren waste. He was appealed to and asked to treat this conduct on the part of the people of Barra as an offence against the criminal law of Scotland, and thereby to repeat the sad history of the events which preceded the Crofters Act of 1886. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition would, he was sure, not minimise the gravity of what he was now saying. If he had acceded to that demand, and if in a question of disputed civic possession—for these people claimed that they had rights on this barren shore—he had sent military, or made a request to the Admiralty for the service of gun-boats, in that part of the Highlands, he would have been doing a thing which would have been the very best leverage to assist in the passing of a drastic measure, but which from the national point of view would have been nothing less than a public disaster. He thought that having held the scales of justice fairly between the proprietors and the tenants in the state of the law, and having asked both of them to find their remedy in the civil courts, and the public peace having been kept, and, in so far as it was infringed, the infringement having been on the most slender scale—having preserved the public peace at a time when any ill-advised action of his might have produced a public calamity, he did say that it was too bad that any man should bring that up as an accusation against him as the holder of his high office. The accusation came in this way. It had been said by his hon. friend who supported the extension of the Crofters Acts all over Scotland that these Acts were preceded by a time of great public trouble. No doubt it was so, and the public trouble had since been allayed, and all through the Highlands, the Hebrides, and the mainland there was now peace and tranquillity which before 1886 was not known. He thought it was a poor retort that because the Crofters Act was defective in one respect, the portion of the statute which affected the acquisition by the new holders of land which in many cases was waste, and that it still continued to produce fragmentary irritation, the defect should be used as an argument against extending the benefits of the main measure of 1886. That was the position in which he stood, and having explained the circumstances he asked the judgment of the House on what he had done. Having stated to the satisfaction of both sides of the House the peaceful course which he counselled and which he had himself pursued, he would say with regard to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition that he thought it was almost unfitting, after the very able speeches of his hon. friends the Solicitor-General and the Member for East Edinburgh, that he should pursue this argument further. He found that the right hon. Gentleman always introduced some change of venue. The right hon. Gentleman had been confronted with the enormous success of this legislation in the crofter districts; and thereupon he took the case of Ireland and denounced the Irish system of fixing fair rents and establishing dual ownership as a colossal failure. It was nothing of the kind. It had been stated by the highest authority with regard to Ireland, Mr. Bailey, that it would have been impossible to reach the stage of purchase in Ireland unless first there had been fair rents and fixity of tenure.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Has Mr. Bailey the permission of his official chief to send letters on this subject to be quoted in the House of Commons?

Mr. THOMAS SHAW: I wrote to Mr. Bailey to obtain this testimony as to Ireland from him.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: He is a civil servant.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said he cared not; and besides, letters from other people to Mr. Bailey had been quoted in the House. Mr. Bailey's testimony, being that of a civil servant, would have great weight. Mr. Bailey said—

> "The power that the Fair Rent Acts gave the Irish tenants of getting a fair rent fixed by a Government tribunal, and the knowledge that they could not be disturbed in the occupation of their holdings as long as they paid their rents, resulted in the people getting courage and self respect. They got into the habit of paying their rents regularly, and steadily and gradually took an interest in the improvement of their holdings."

Why civil servants should not write historical facts of that kind to anybody in the world he did not know.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) asked whether it was not the case that the late Government appealed to Mr. Bailey to write a report on the subject and that the late Government published it as a Parliamentary Paper.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said that he remembered something of the kind taking place. But why had there been any defect in the administration of the Irish Act? The defect in the Irish Act had pandered to what he called the national passion for litigation. The expenses of litigation in fixing fair rents in Ireland were positively stupendous. A small holder had a fair rent fixed, then there was an appeal, and there was a still further appeal before he got any alteration in the rent originally fixed. A sum of £105 had to be expended for every £1 of alteration on a fair rent. That was only an illustration of how the Irish Act was administered. In Scotland, on the other hand, there was immediate inspection, a final determination, and the fixing of a fair rent at a cost of not more than 1s. 6d. for a period of seven years. Therefore, the system of fixity of tenure had had a fair chance in Scotland which it had never had before. The Government in providing the machinery for the working of this Bill took the example nearest home. The system set up by the Crofters Act had had a fair chance, and they proposed to extend it. It had been said that there were confused utterances in 1886. There must indeed have been confused utterances then. In 1886 the right hon. Gentleman opposite declared that the distinction between the Highlands and Lowlands was shadowy and indefensible. His predecessor, the present Lord Justice Clerk, said—

> "What is the exceptional position of the crofter in the Highlands as regards the arable part of his croft, either historically or on present fact, that will make his case different from that of any other person to whom a landlord has given a piece of land in any other part of the United Kingdom?"

That was testimony which could not be put under the category of "confused utterances." He himself thought that it would have been well that the Crofters Act had begun in the whole of Scotland, but having begun in certain districts of the Highlands and having produced those magnificent results they desired that it should be extended. The right hon. Gentleman said that he was not aware of those numerous improvements which had taken place in the Highlands of Scotland. He would make no mistake this time, and would not cite a letter from Sir David Grant, but the Report of the Royal Commission on the Highlands and Islands presented in the year 1892. In that Report the Commissioners unanimously gave this testimony—

> "Our opinion is that, speaking generally, the Act has had a beneficial effect, and particularly in the following directions. In the first place the fixing of a fair rent has to a large extent removed from the minds of crofters the sense of hardship arising from the belief that they were made to pay rent on their own improvements, or otherwise made to pay at an excessive rate for soil of a poor quality. In the second place, combination of a fair rent with statutory security of tenure has not only taken away or allayed causes of discontent, but has imparted a new spirit to crofters, and imbued them with fresh energy."

And then followed this remarkable passage—

> "The abiding sense produced that the permanent improvements which a crofter makes upon his holding will, if he complies with certain reasonable statutory conditions, accrue either to himself or to his family successor, will not be taxable by the landlord in the form of increased rent, and, moreover, will have a money value under a claim for compensation on renunciation of tenancy or removal from his holding, has led to vigorous efforts towards improvement by crofters in many quarters. For instance, we found that more attention is being paid to cultivation, to rotation of crops, to reclamation of outruns, to fencing, and to the formation or repair of township roads; but most conspicuous of all effects perceptible is that upon buildings including both dwelling-houses and steadings. In a considerable number of localities we found new and improved houses and steadings erected by the crofters themselves since the passing of the Act. In the third place, while the enlargement sections of the Act have not proved so effectively operative as was intended or anticipated, we did not fail to observe, in the various cases of enlargement of holdings which came under our eye, that the enlargements granted had been, as far as they went, of great benefit to the holdings enlarged. And, in the fourth place, the percentage of arrears cancelled has terminated liabilities which could never have been met."

In 1886 right hon. Gentleman opposite declared that the distinction between the Highlands and the Lowlands was shadowy and indefensible. All that the present Bill did was to extend the principle which had been made applicable to the Highlands with so much success to other parts of Scotland where the small holders and agricultural labourers were more responsive than those in the Highlands to the inducements for making a good livelihood. Therefore it was that the Government viewed with great hope the extension of the Act to the rest of Scotland. He must say that one of the satisfactory features of all the agitation was that there had been no selfish desire on the part of the Highlanders to confine the benefits of the Act to their own districts, and that there had been exhibited an admirable solidarity of feeling between the people in the Highlands and the Lowlands in Scotland.

Mr. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.) said that the three speeches which they had just listened to had dealt with the Crofters Act and the land tenure of Ireland. That of the right hon. and learned Gentlemen the Lord Advocate was an example of the argument used before the Committee upstairs. Not a single reference had been made to the question of the land tenure in the Lowlands, and not a single argument had been advanced to justify the extension of the provisions of the Crofters Act to the Lowlands. The hon. and learned

Member for South Edinburgh had told them that the Crofters Act had been a great success, and that therefore it should be extended to the Lowlands. Further the hon. and learned Member stated that in 1886 the Highlands were in a state of incipient rebellion. He would like to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman if he thought that the Lowlands were at this time in a state of incipient rebellion? The Solicitor-General for Scotland, who had exhibited considerable reticence in speaking in Committee upstairs, had told them that security of tenure was all that was given under this Bill and that fair rents should be fixed in order to ensure that the tenant should not be rented on his own improvements. Of course, where a tenant had effected his own improvements, he had a right to security of tenure, but that system did not exist in the Lowlands; there was hardly any instance in which that custom held good. When the Solicitor-General asked why they should object to give security of tenure, he answered in the first place that the landlord spent vast sums of money on his land and he objected to having a tenant foisted upon him with security of tenure by which half the landlord's profit was taken away. He would like to ask the Lord Advocate why it was that the small holders within burgh boundaries and tenants of Crown lands were excluded from the benefits of the Bill? They had as good a right to those benefits as other tenants. He believed that the reason was based on the system of rating which obtained in the Highlands; the crofters would not purchase their land because their rates would be largely increased. Then in Committee they had been told that some of the buildings which had been erected by the crofters had cost £30. He asked whether any agricultural labourer in the Lowlands of Scotland would be content to live in such a house. A cottage for an agricultural labourer in the Lowlands cost at least £250, and that was erected at the expense of the landlord. The conditions which existed in the congested districts and in other parts of the Highlands were absolutely inapplicable to the Lowlands, where all the improvements and the equipments of the farm were made by the landlord. He maintained that under this Bill a large part of the property of the landlord would be confiscated. What was the reason for extending the system to Roxburghshire and Berwickshire and not extending it to Northumberland? They were going to consider the English Land Bill next week, and the conditions in that measure were absolutely different from those contained in this Bill. All that they asked for was that the Prime Minister should extend to the Lowlands of Scotland the provisions contained in the English Bill. What was good enough for Northumberland should be good enough for Roxburghshire and Berwickshire. There might be no objection to extend the crofting system to districts in Scotland where the conditions were similar to those in the Highlands. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill would give some answer to the arguments used by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lambton.

*SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) said that they had heard in Committee times without number that the success of the Crofters Act in the Highlands was a justification for applying the system to the rest of Scotland. It was almost remarkable to think the exact knowledge which some hon. Members representing the Lowlands had of the crofting areas. The hon. and learned Member for South Edinburgh had gone back to the year 1885, before the Crofters Act was passed, and compared the condition of the Highlands then with their condition at the present time. The hon. Member had attributed the prosperous state of the Highlands to the working of the Crofters Act, but he thought that if the hon. Member visited the crofting districts in the Western Highlands of Scotland he would not dare to say that the crofters were prospering solely by agriculture. In those parts it was quite impossible for a man to live entirely by agriculture, and he subsisted by cloth making and fishing, without which he would not be able to secure a livelihood. Every man who at the present time paid a rent of £2 or £3 a year would come under this Bill compulsorily. He wished to point out that a large number of crofters did not want to come under the Bill; many of them contracted out of the Crofters Act by taking leases, because they objected to doing their own improvements. Taking the case of four crofters, three contracted out, with the result in the case of the three, that the landlord came down and made improvements while the fourth man, who declined to contract out, had to make his own improvements and had in consequence to live in a small hut. That was just the sort of thing which one might expect to happen. The hon. Member had said that not a copper was spent by the landlord on improvements in these districts. That was absolutely untrue, and on very many estates it would be found that the landlords had built the cottages and other structures largely at their own expense. The crofter did not depend on agriculture for his livelihood and just grew enough for his own consumption. Men were very often employed as gillies on an estate, made cloth or fished when they lived on the coast—an entirely different condition from that existing in the Lowlands where they did not depend upon subsidiary industries. There was another point. It was said that the people had built their houses owing to the operation of the Crofters Act, but that was not so. On his own estate there were places which ten years ago were in an exceedingly bad condition, but if the hon. Baronet would go there now he would see a very remarkable improvement. The improvement in these houses was not due to the efforts of the landlords, but was largely the result of the money sent over by people who had emigrated to Canada and elsewhere. He therefore asked hon. Members not to be led away by the speeches of the hon. and learned Member for South Edinburgh and other hon. Members opposite who showed a profound ignorance of the actual facts of the case. If hon. Members would visit the Highlands and Islands they would, he thought, know a little more about the facts of the case.

Mr. ABEL SMITH (Hertfordshire, Hertford) said that however partial or limited the result of the Crofters Act might be in the Highlands of Scotland, he ventured to assert that its operation had very little to do with the Bill now under consideration. This Bill had been introduced by His Majesty's Government, and under it the Crofters Act was to be extended to the whole of Scotland. The argument of the Solicitor-General for Scotland in its favour, however, was a most remarkable one, and more remarkable for what it omitted than for what it stated. The Solicitor-General said that the Crofters Act had been applied to a part of Scotland and had overcome economic difficulties ; why not therefore apply it to the whole of Scotland ? He thought, however, that even by hon. Members on the Liberal side it would be admitted that this legislation was of a very exceptional kind and that only exceptional circumstances would justify Parliament in passing measures of this sort which interfered with the ordinary relations of landlord and tenant and did away with their freedom to contract with each other. The question they had to consider was whether these exceptional circumstances which, undoubtedly, did prevail in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland and which did exist in Ireland when Mr. Gladstone introduced his legislation in regard to that country, now existed in the Lowlands of Scotland. For his own part, he ventured to say that nothing had been stated and no facts had been brought forward which justified the extension of these exceptional provisions to the Lowlands of Scotland. One hon. Member had said, "Why not have the same advantages which were enjoyed by the Highlands of Scotland extended to the plains." But what they on that side of the House said was that the same circumstances did not prevail. Anyone who would look at the debates upon the Bill passed in the year 1886 would see that the whole basis of that Bill was that the situation in the Highlands and the Lowlands was totally different. The Government had never proved that the provisions of the Crofters Act were applicable to that part of Scotland to which at present it did not apply. Taking the Highlands of Scotland as a whole, the condition of land tenure there was entirely different from that which prevailed in the Lowlands, which was essentially the same as in England. All through these debates, both in this House and in the Committee, he had noticed that the Lord

Advocate and the other supporters of the Bill had taken the whole of their arguments from the crofting country. They had dilated on the improvements in the condition of the people there, but they had never undertaken to show that the proposals of this Bill were in any way applicable to the Lowlands, and had given no real reasons for extending these provisions. If there was a demand for small holdings in the Lowlands that demand ought to be met by other methods than those in this clause, which made so sweeping a change in the system of land tenure of holdings up to £50 in value. The clause extended at one fell swoop the whole of the provisions of the Crofters Act, and he contended that the Government would have been far wiser if they had followed the report of Lord Onslow's Committee and proceeded on entirely different lines. The question was not whether they were benefitting the occupiers of small farms in the Lowlands, or whether they were likely to confer a benefit on the community as a whole by increasing the number of these holdings. The real question was whether the Government was justified in imposing these exceptional provisions. The only question was where to draw the line, and his contention was that the Government had drawn it in the wrong place. They ought to draw the line between the Highlands of Scotland, where it had been to a large extent the custom of the occupiers to reclaim the land they occupied and to put up the buildings, and the Lowlands, where the occupiers occupied the land, the buildings on which had been erected at great expense by the landowner or his predecessors. He could not help thinking that if the Government had adopted the same policy for Scotland as they had adopted for England they would have done a great deal more to promote the increase of small holdings than they would do by trying to force such a revolutionary measure as this through both Houses of Parliament.

*SIR J. DEWAR said there had been some confusion in comparing the arguments in support of this Bill and those in favour of the Act of 1886. The objects were entirely different. The Crofters Act of 1886 was necessary in order to give the crofters fixity of tenure and a fair rent, but this was a Bill to encourage the creation of small agricultural holdings, and the question they had to consider was whether the proposals of the Government were likely to encourage the formation of small holdings. He thought they were. He believed that the application of the principles of fixity of tenure and fair rent would immediately result in many small economic holdings being created in the South of Scotland, and he warmly supported the Bill. The Crofters Act had been an absolute success where land was available for the extension of these holdings, and it had been unsuccessful where land had been withheld by the proprietors or where there was no land to be had. He had heard no reason why the proposals of the Bill should not be excluded to the South of Scotland. It had been said it would have the effect of drying up the sources from which the improvements were made. The landlords at present carried out the improvements because they found it paid them to do so. They usually got a fair percentage for the expenditure they made upon the holdings and if they had done so in the past why should they not do so in the future? If the source was dried up another source would be opened which might prove more fruitful. The alternatives to the proposals of the Government were purchase and the creation of small holdings through the county councils. He did not think the latter was possible in Scotland. In four parishes in Inverness-shire there were 1,200 applications for small holdings and the county council had not succeeded in securing a single holding for one of these 1,200 applicants. The other alternative was purchase; but he much preferred the proposals of the Bill because in his opinion they would work with less disturbance to the present social order. Were they to be told that the crofting landlords were only rent chargers so far as the crofts were concerned, but so far as the large farms were concerned they were landlords in every respect? The landlords in the crofting country took just as lively an interest in the small as they did in the large holdings.

MR. JOWETT called attention to the fact that forty Members were not present.

House counted; and forty Members being found present—

*SIR J. DEWAR submitted that under the proposal of the Government the landlords were secured against financial loss, while a large number of good new tenants would be obtained, a result which would be of benefit not only to the community but also of advantage to the landlords as well as the tenants.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said during the discussions in Committee he had moved an Amendment which was slightly different from that now before the House, to confine the operation of the Crofters Act to localities which were in the nature of crofting districts, and which were under crofting conditions. The Amendment moved by the hon. Gentleman below him was practically to the same effect. What defence had they heard of the proposal to create small holdings by the extension of the Crofters Act? The hon. Member who had just sat down had given them some arguments in favour of the Crofters Act, but he confessed that his laudation of that measure was something like damning with faint praise. Another hon. Member had made an elaborate panegyric of the Act, but he must say that as he listened to it he failed to see any good ground for the laudation. He had told them that from 1886 to the present time immense improvement had been made in the Highlands. That was very true, but had there not been many other causes operating besides the Crofters Act? The Crofters Commission was the result of the attention that had been drawn to several great economic evils in the Highlands, which other people besides legislators were attempting to cure and remove. An immense amount of benevolent and charitable effort was spent about that time in the Highlands, and there was no doubt that a great deal of good was done. Besides which, the operation of the Act of 1872 was penetrating by that time into the Highlands, and in the districts where the Crofters Act was operative it was especially beneficial, not from an educational point of view only, but from a financial point of view. After all, they might have run rather too hard in their praise of the Crofters Act. He quite admitted the circumstances of the population with which they had to deal, and the very peculiar position of the Highlanders of Scotland, who were under very remarkable conditions to which the Crofters Act was to some extent suitable, and did some good. But he for one, whatever his fellow Members might say, felt bound to state that he did not intend to advance the view that the position created by the Crofters Act for many of his fellow countrymen was an ideal position, or one which he wished to continue. He wished that the right hon. Gentleman knew, as he did, some of the places where the crofters were fixed now, among the east bays of Harris and the east seaboard of Lewis, and he would then see whether theirs was an ideal position which he would wish for his fellow countrymen. The Crofters Act had been beneficial and had done much to secure to the people places they loved so much, but he was not sorry to think that many of the children of these crofters had shown that energy of their fathers which had done so much good to Scotland, and were helping to colonise different parts of the Empire, instead of staying at home. The career of the crofter was not one in which any great ambition could be satisfied. They had passed the Crofters Act for a peculiar population, and had done so in obedience to a very long and very romantic history. The feeling inborn in the Highlanders came from their land system, and it existed to this day. They had a land hunger which did not exist in many other parts of Scotland. They wished to cling not only to the land but to the bit of land which had been held by their fathers; they were attached to it, and preferred to cling to it rather than seek better economic conditions elsewhere. They had satisfied that hunger by an abundant charity which was wholly justified, and which he was not going to deny, or wished to withdraw. But he must remind hon. and right hon. Gentlemen that they could not create an economic state of things, nor would a large society ever flourish very long, on what were essentially uneconomic conditions. They met for a time the traditions of these Highlanders, with their separate language, their separate racial peculiarities and their interesting and romantic attachment to the soil of their fathers, but they did not establish anything like conditions which could be defended by any proposition of political economy. What were they going to do now? They were going to extend a system which no doubt had worked fairly well in the peculiar circumstances which justified its application to a small proportion of the Scottish population—a portion who, from their traditions and instincts, had no great desire to work under the pressure and strain of modern economic conditions. He was perfectly certain that whoever studied the conditions of Scotland would agree with him in thinking that to be the case. They were now going to establish these strange and unusual conditions for a population which, above all things, had a keen commercial instinct, which had never exhibited any special kind of attachment for a particular spot, but which moved about with peculiar readiness from one part of the country to another, as prompted by commercial prospects. They carried on their business just as would any Scotsmen in cities, in the sense that they were not likely to be very much overpowered by romantic notions in regard to the land which they cultivated, but worked in the same way and just as hard as any commercial firm. They were attempting to impose these conditions upon a section of agriculturists who, out of all the agriculturists in the country, were perhaps the most keenly commercial, and the most determined to advance by successive steps to prosperity, and who had by that means perhaps the most advanced system of agriculture in the whole country—he spoke of Midlothian and East Lothian, which were well-known specimens of advanced agriculture. The Solicitor-General had said that there was another very strong reason, not for merely extending small holdings to the Lowlands of Scotland, but for extending them on precisely the system of the Crofters Act. What was that reason? It was, the hon. and learned Gentleman said, that the crofters were exempt from rating upon their buildings and improvements; extend the Crofters Act, and then there would be a very much stronger motive for tenants remaining as they were at present, because they would pay a much lower rent than they would otherwise do. But did the hon. and learned Gentleman think that if the rates were not paid by one man they were to drop like manna from the heavens? If the whole of those small holders who were to be created by the Bill were to be exempted from rates, precisely as under the Crofters Act, would their neighbours not be unjustly rated? Let them take a concrete case. This Bill was restricted to tenancies of 50 acres or £50. Where market gardens were cultivated with success a new landholder might be established on an estate holding about 50 acres, and probably paying a rental of £250 because such land was often worth about £5 an acre. This landholder would not be charged rates upon his buildings or improvements although he might have admirable and expensive equipment, whereas his fellow landholder ten or fifteen miles away at the foot of the Lammermoor Hills would have to pay high rates. Was that fair or reasonable? When they were dealing with the Crofters Act Parliament was legislating in a charitable spirit with men who were not being dealt with according to the full rigour of the law. The crofters were exempted from rates, and he wondered whether hon. Members opposite were aware of the effect of that. The result of exempting them at the time was that almost all the parishes in the West Highlands and in some of the mainland crofting districts became bankrupt within two years of the passing of the Crofters Act. That was a fact which did not appear to be present to the minds of many hon. Members who were supporting this Bill. He was specially concerned in the matter because in 1888 they had laid before them deliverances from every school board in that wide district to the effect that they had given notice to the teachers to close their schools on the ground that unless the Education Department gave them assistance they could not raise the amount required by any rate even at 20s. in the £, because so many of the inhabitants escaped rates under the Act. Lord Goschen, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, gave them ample means, they took the local management into their own hands, and tided the school boards through the period when they were almost bankrupt. They did all this at the cost of the Imperial Exchequer and the situation was saved.

The amount was £7,000 or £8,000 to begin with, and it rapidly diminished, but that would not have been the sum required if the system had spread all over Scotland. There would be a vast number of new landholders under this Bill, and they would be exempted from rates altogether. That would inevitably be the result, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman could not deny that. Did the right hon. Gentleman forget that he had only a limited sum at his disposal? This Bill was not going to be worked like the English measure through the rates of the county councils but through the Imperial Exchequer. The more they extended the Crofters Act to the Lowlands of Scotland, and the more charitable generosity they showed to those districts which had no need of their generosity, the more they would deprive the needy population of the crofting districts of their proper share of help from the Imperial Exchequer. If the Government persisted in this vicious process the more would they deprive the poorer districts of that special gift Parliament meant for them, and the more would they spread that gift over the prosperous commercial Lowland farming districts where the farmers were perfectly well able to take care of themselves. For those reasons he cordially supported this Amendment, and he earnestly trusted that the Government would see their way to modify the determination they had shown to proceed in this way.

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor) said he wished to draw attention to the compulsory powers under the Bill, because they obliged every small farmer who came within the scope of the Bill to become *nolens volens* a crofter. The Solicitor-General had stated that he had never heard before that it could be considered a misfortune to have fixity of tenure, but he ventured to say that even that proposition was open to some criticism. In England they found that farmers preferred yearly tenancies rather than a more definite form of tenure. There were small farmers in Scotland who had shown a distinct fear of coming within the four corners of this Bill. There was the definite case of a small farmer in Inverness-shire who was paying under the £50 limit, and he asked his landlord to raise his rent to £50 in order that he might escape coming under the Crofters Act. Why did some of the tenants object to become crofters? Simply because they knew that so long as they remained small farmers they were in the position in which the landlord did the repairs and provided the equipment. The moment a man became a crofter that condition of things would necessarily cease. The Solicitor-General said he saw no reason why, after security of tenure had been given, the landlord should not continue to do the repairs as before. He also stated that the essence of this Bill was security of tenure, and that a fair rent was necessary, because otherwise the landlord had it in his power by raising the rent to get rid of an undesirable tenant. When the landlord's money was used for repairs and equipment what other weapon did the landlord need? Surely by refusing to do the repairs and not doing anything for the tenant he could use that weapon with as much readiness as raising the rent. He thought it was quite unnecessary to make it compulsory that all small farmers of less than 50 acres or paying under £50 should become crofters, and they ought to be allowed to refuse to become crofters if they chose.

MR. URE: They may refuse.

MR. J. F. MASON said that in that case he had misunderstood the Bill. It was quite true that ownership was not desired by the crofters, but that was on account of the rating which would necessarily follow. Dual ownership might be successful in crofting districts, but that system would not afford a final settlement of the question which would in the end be satisfactory to the whole of Scotland. If they were to have dual ownership the only satisfactory system was that which was known as the Evesham custom under which the tenant had to find a successor if he wished to get rid of his holding, and under which the landlord could not disturb him without compensation.

SIR F. BANBURY said there were only five Radical Members present in the House and he would put forward some arguments in the hope that some of them might be converted. The hon. Member for Inverness-shire said he was against the Amendment because the Crofters Act had been a success in the crofting districts of Scotland. That was not a sufficient argument for the extension of the Act unless they went further and said that the same conditions which applied in the crofting areas applied also in the other areas of Scotland. The only argument adduced by the hon. Baronet to show that the Crofters Act had been a success was that in a place which he knew there were formerly only three slated houses—the laird's house, the manse, and a kennel, and that, soon after the Crofters Act became law, there were many slated cottages. As had been pointed out, the wave of a legislative wand did not produce money, so that the money required to erect the cottages must have been earned under the conditions which existed before the passing of the Act. The conditions in the Lowlands were entirely different from those in the Highlands. The question of rating had been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. It seemed to him that that was a very simple question. He was rather glad that it existed, for he was certain of one thing, namely, that nothing was more likely to give a damaging blow to the Radical Party. He would not be sorry if such a thing should take place. It was evident that if the proposed system of rating was applied to the rich districts of Scotland, say in districts where market gardening was carried on, it would produce dissatisfaction. The last thing which a Scotsman wanted to do was to pay what his neighbour ought to pay. He thought the rating clause alone would give the Scottish ratepayers cause to curse the day they voted for the great Radical Party. He could not congratulate the Solicitor-General on the arguments which he had brought forward in answer to his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition His chief argument was that it was impossible to distinguish between a man who had made improvements on his farm and a man who had not, and that it was equally important to both tenants that there should be security of tenure. The hon. and learned Gentleman said he had never heard any argument advanced which would induce him to alter his opinion. Might he point out that during the whole history of the Liberal and Radical Party the arguments advanced in connection with land legislation had been in favour of a distinction being made? The land legislation for Ireland proposed by Mr. Gladstone in 1870 was founded on the difference between the man who had made improvements and the man who had not. Mr. Gladstone found the justification of the Land Act of that year in the fact that the landlord did not find the capital necessary for the improvement of the soil, whereas he did in Scotland. Therefore he claimed that the greatest apostle of the Liberal and Radical Party during the past forty years had put forward the argument which the learned Solicitor-General said he could not understand. It was the only argument on which legislation of this sort ought to be based. This question had been discussed over and over again in Committee, and now that there had been a discussion in the House the public would understand the reasons why the Opposition objected so much to this clause. If the Radical Members would look into the Amendment they would see that its acceptance would not interfere with the creation of small holdings. The Solicitor-General would admit that the crofting Members on the Committee upstairs had continuously and vociferously declared that the great mistake of the Bill was the attempt to foist the crofting system on parts of the country where the conditions were entirely different. He recollected speeches made by the hon. Members for Sutherland, Ross and Cromarty, and Orkney complaining that a Radical Government was engrafting on this Bill crofting legislation. He was sure that nothing would please them more than the acceptation of the Amendment of his right hon. friend. He was surprised at the absence from the House of those hon. Members, but no doubt influences were at work to make it undesirable that they should be present. He hoped that the Amendment would be adopted.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) said it had been stated that no one in the Lowlands was keenly interested in this measure. He could say that at a meeting held in his own division in Edinburgh to consider the matter the chairman and other speakers were men who had been brought up on the land. The result of the meeting was that a resolution was passed that the crofting legislation should be extended to the whole of Scotland.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY: What did the meeting consist of?

MR. C. E. PRICE said that it was a meeting of the Executive of the Liberal Association in the division. [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers.] Seeing that he had been returned by a very large majority at the general election, he did not see why he did not represent the views of his constituents. The remarkable thing about the resolution passed at that meeting was that it expressly approved the fact that under this Bill the smallholders would get security of tenure and fair rents without the necessity of purchase. He knew the whole of Scotland as well as any Member in the House, and he could say in behalf of many of the farming districts that the Bill was demanded by the people. It was quite true that the landlords and a great many of the large farmers were opposed to the Bill. No class was more anxious to keep smallholders out of their district, because if these were introduced there would be a scarcity of agricultural labourers. They did not want competition for those agricultural labourers. The Bill would be the best means of enabling the labouring class in the agricultural districts to acquire small holdings until they had gained experience which would entitle them to take larger farms. In regard to the Highlands, he had visited every district where the crofters had been evicted in the old time, and had repeatedly visited them since the Crofters Act was passed, and he could testify from what he had seen to the enormous improvement which had been made in those parts. He thought that the money which had been spent by the crofters since they had acquired security of tenure and fixed rents compared very favourably with what the landlords had done. He contended that it was important that the tenants should spend their money on their holdings, for that was a security that they would remain on the land. The landlords seemed to be very much afraid of the Crofters Commission, but it had been admitted that the Crofters Act had been of immense advantage to both the tenants and the landlords. There was now a happy and truly friendly relationship between landlords and tenants which did not exist before. No charge could be made against the Crofters Commission of dealing unfairly with the landlords; and what right had anyone to assume that the new Commission would deal otherwise with them. He knew of a case where a landlord had divided two large farms into small holdings, but did not spend a single copper on the thirty-two small holdings so created. Seven years afterwards the tenants applied to the Crofters Commission to get fair rents fixed, and in thirty-one out of the thirty-two small holdings created the Crofters Commission fixed exactly the same rent as had been agreed upon between the landlord and the tenant. He altogether denied that there was no demand for this Bill in the Lowlands. It was all very well to say that it was necessary to bring in land purchase in Ireland because of the failure of dual ownership; but the great trouble in Ireland was that under the Act of 1881 the rents were fixed for a period of fifteen years, and everybody knew that during that period the price of farm produce had fallen very considerably. To his mind there would be no justification in refusing to extend by this Bill to the Lowlands of Scotland the crofter legislation which had been of inestimable advantage to the development and improvement of the Highland district.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY said that when the hon. Member asked the House to believe that there was a great feeling in favour of this Bill in the Lowlands of Scotland he only supported that by a reference to a small party meeting in Edinburgh. He had been told in Committee that there had been an enthusiastic meeting somewhere at which nearly all the agricultural labourers had expressed themselves as most cordially in support of the Bill, but it was found afterwards that those who were present at that meeting had come away more full of cake than of conviction as to the merits of the measure. He did not think it meant anything at all that there were urban populations in favour of the Bill. He wondered whether those people took their opinions from the Bill itself or from the laudatory views expressed to them by their Members who wished to put the Bill in an agreeable light from the party point of view. There was not the least difference of opinion that there had been an exodus from the country districts to the urban districts which led to overcrowding, and that the attempts to arrest the decrease of the rural population had been a failure; but because one held those views it was not necessary to ride off at a tangent and say that this Bill would accomplish all that they had in view. He could not quite see the relevance of some of the remarks of the hon. Member for Central Edinburgh as to the application of the Crofters Act to the whole of Scotland. He had never yet heard any valid reason advanced why the Crofters Act should be extended to the Lowlands, and there was also no valid reason why the benefits of the measure should be extended to tenants with £50 annual value. If there was any reason for this why should it not be extended to all tenants in Scotland and to tenants in the United Kingdom generally? An hon. Gentleman had told them that afternoon that opinion was more advanced in Scotland than in England, and that England was not prepared for such a measure. He would prefer to put it the other way about, and say that the people of England were more aware of the crux of the situation, while they might be prepared to make an experiment *in corpore vile* on the unfortunate agriculturists of Scotland. Of course, he had no doubt that if one went to the majority of tenants and asked if they wanted security of tenure they would say "Yes," but that was a sort of claptrap which was likely to carry people away. What they were giving to one man they were taking away from someone else. Were they justified in taking capital out of one man's pocket and putting it into the pocket of another? He was surprised that the Lord Advocate should say that it was a misfortune to listen to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, because he agreed with what the right hon. Gentleman had pointed out, that whereas in Ireland dual ownership already existed, in Scotland it did not. In this case they were giving away something which did not belong to the State and which it had no right to give away, and which did not belong to the tenant to whom they were giving it. He quite agreed that they should give the tenant security for the capital which he had invested in the land, and that they ought to prevent the landlord raising the rent on his improvements. But those objects were secured by the Agricultural Holdings Acts which had been passed from time to time to regulate the customs of the country in some cases, and in others to introduce new customs. In some cases the custom of the country had been more in favour of the tenant than the Agricultural Holdings Acts, and the tenants capital was protected either by custom or legislation. But then hon. Members came along and said the tenant wanted more, and in order to protect the tenant he must have fixity of tenure. Surely there was only one corollary to that, and that was to adopt a system of purchase. He held, however, that it would be better that the tenant should not have security of tenure but have the benefit of the landlord's capital. He thought that the middle course, to leave him as tenant and give him some rights of ownership, was a fraudulent one, although, of course, it was easy to gain support for it from the farmers. If, moreover, fixity of tenure was given, why should not the right of free sale of that tenure be given? The right of free sale had been most disastrous wherever it had been tried. If they gave a man a right which he had never had before why should they not give him the power to dispose of it to the best advantage? On a former occasion the Lord Advocate told them that if there was any defect in Irish Land Acts it was due to the right of free sale, but now they were told it was due to the passion for litigation. Now, however, the time had come when a Radical Government would put forward a programme of fixity of tenure, fair rent, and free sale. Free sale seemed to him to be the inevitable accompaniment of fixity of tenure unless purchase was resorted to. As to dual ownership there was a good deal of difference of opinion between the Solicitor-General for Scotland and the Lord Advocate which had never been cleared up. He would like to ask any member of the Government if he could point to anything outside the Crofters Act where dual ownership had been a success. He alluded to the Crofters Act because the crofters had been in a peculiar position. They were not inclined to move from one croft to another, but the rights of the parties would become quite different if this Bill became law. He had a great fear that the Bill would draw capital from the land. Whatever might be the experience of the Crofters Act, and however good-natured landlords might have been in the crofting districts, he did not see how the tenants or the Government could count upon such good nature in future in regard to a large measure such as this. He feared that the result of the Bill would be that buildings would fall into disrepair, and pointed to the fact that in the crofting districts the custom had always been for the crofters to look after the repair of the house, which they or their predecessors had built. It might be said they were conferring a benefit on the landlord by taking away from him the duty of keeping the buildings in repair, but then the Land Court would come along and fix the rent, and he supposed would take that into consideration, and would say that under the circumstances the landlord was not entitled to the same rent as he had been getting, and the rent would be reduced. But the amount by which it was reduced would be the amount of the robbery committed against the landlord by this Bill. If it was necessary in the opinion of the Government that security of tenure should be introduced into agriculture, and if they were quite persuaded that agriculture was not prosperous in this country for that reason alone, there was only one honest course for them to pursue, viz., to bring in a Land Purchase Bill which would give the tenant absolute security of tenure. He was of opinion that the existing state of affairs should remain, believing that if the provisions of this Bill were extended to the whole of Scotland it could only end in disaster.

*MR. MOLTENO said the hon. Member who had just sat down was the only speaker who had not admitted that the condition of the rural districts was unsatisfactory and that it was desirable that some remedy should be found for the existing state of things. Hon. Members opposite did not apparently appreciate the condition to which the rural districts had been reduced. He regretted the strong language used by the Leader of the Opposition, and was glad the Member for South Dublin who knew the Bill had never used such language. The Leader of the Opposition had spoken of the immorality of taking a man's capital and handing it over to someone else, in perpetuity, the suggestion being that the capital was handed over without any compensation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not mean that there was crude spoliation. What he said was that to take away a man's capital and give it to somebody else whom he did not himself choose to manage it, and give him the interest they thought proper, was preposterous.

*MR. MOLTENO was obliged for the explanation. The right hon. Gentleman's previous condemnations seemed to him to be unqualified. The Bill did not take away property without compensation. The property was used in the same way as the landlord used it. He received a fair rent for it. Therefore, he thought the right hon. Gentleman's language was hardly correct.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said it was just as if it took away one of the hon. Gentleman's steamers.

*MR. MOLTENO said there was no analogy between a steamer and the land. Every year this House was legislating with regard to the land of this country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said they had legislated for steamers as well.

*MR. MOLTENO said that land in this country had been taken compulsorily for the purposes of public health, locomotion, defence, and other public purposes. Land had never been dealt with on the same footing as other property; and when the right hon. Gentleman spoke of its being in perpetuity he lost sight of the powers of resumption in the Bill, and the mineral, timber, and sporting rights which were reserved. Therefore, the whole and absolute right was not taken from the landlord in any sense. All this Bill said was that while the land was agricultural land it should be so used as to maintain a larger number of people on it. They had been asked for evidence of the desire of the Lowlands for this extension. The evidence was that the Lowlands sent Members to the House to ask for it. The Lowlands were suffering from enormous depopulation and the Government believed that that was due wholly and solely to the land laws of the country. The Leader of the Opposition said it was due to free trade, but he would point out that the introduction of free trade had not reduced prices. Until the year 1879 prices rose. Rents of land in this country rose from 1846 to 1875 by 21 per cent. Rural depopulation began in 1861; between 1861–1901 the prices were highest and the rural population in Scotland declined by 38 per cent. The bulk of the rural depopulation took place in Scotland between 1861 and 1879, therefore it could not be contended that free trade had anything to do with it. If the towns had largely increased in size there was all the more reason why agriculture should have improved, because the large towns were the greatest purchasers of produce in the world and were the greatest supporters of agriculture. Yet while our towns had increased in size our agriculture had declined. Other countries which had been wise enough to revise their land laws had been doing exceedingly well since 1879. Our land laws had led to an enormous decrease of all those who were connected with the land. It was notorious that Scotland was held by a small number of owners in a way in which no other civilised country was held. Tenant farmers were decreasing. The whole of Scotland could only produce 53,000 tenant farmers as against the 6,000,000 who cultivated land in France and 5,000,000 in Germany. There was no country in the whole of Europe where so little land was cultivated by the owners. It was all cultivated by tenants and landless labourers.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY: This Bill will not alter that.

*MR. MOLTENO said he believed that it would alter it. But in addition to this our land laws were sending down the value of land.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY: No, it is your legislation.

*MR. MOLTENO said that since 1881, 2,000,000 acres had gone out of cultivation. While Denmark had added 1,250,000 acres and Germany had added 750,000 acres to its cultivated land, we had declined to the extent above mentioned. The great trouble was that a man interested in agriculture looked forward for promotion to having his own land which he could cultivate. [OPPOSITION cheers.] He knew what that cheer meant; it meant a system of purchase. If it was suggested they should go from the present system to a system of purchase, that could not be done. It was a counsel of perfection, to offer land for purchase to the landless labourers of Great Britain. It could not be done. It had been tried in Ireland, and had broken down; enormous losses had been incurred, and the whole arrangement must be changed. If they ever attempted to do the same thing in Great Britain they knew that it would absolutely break down. If they offered a man security of tenure they offered him something which he could accept; he could use his money to stock the holding, and did not need to sink his capital in purchase. A man without accumulated capital could not possibly do that sort of thing. The Bill proposed to increase the number of holdings. In the first place it took the holdings which existed and gave them the protection of the law; it gave security of tenure at a fair rent, and it gave security for improvements. The small holdings which did exist were stereotyped and protected, and the tenants felt secure in investing their labour and their little capital in those holdings. And then the Bill provided additional machinery. Where there was a demand for holdings and where it was quite clear that the demand ought to be met, they had Commissioners who were ready to facilitate the demands and in that way they opposed the destruction of small holdings, which, unless they were protected by legislation, gradually became absorbed in the larger holdings. Therefore, they had the means of increasing those holdings, and they believed in this way they were going to offer a career to a large number who would be trained to cultivate the soil. They wanted to reform the land laws. Every country had done it except ourselves. We had done it to some extent in Ireland, no doubt, but it was high time that we did it here. What was happening to the people of this country? They might say that they were only poor people, and not worth considering. [AN HON. MEMBER: Who says that?] He said it might be stated. They saw what was happening. They were being driven from their homes by hundreds and thousands. In his own county 1,200 men had been driven out in the last twenty years. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why driven out?] In one parish alone in his constituency they had pulled down 167 houses—so many homes destroyed in the last forty years. There could be no more serious matter for which the legislature was responsible, because it was by law this was caused, and it was for Parliament to alter that state of things, to stop the process that was going on, and if possible to restore some people to the land while preventing others from being driven away.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said in Committee it had been always a matter of great interest to hear the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire, and they had the same satisfaction in listening to him in the House. He would not follow the hon. Gentleman into his excursions into tariff reform, though he agreed with a great many of the remarks which he had made. He had said very truly that free trade when introduced raised prices. He asked hon. Gentlemen who sat on the same benches as the hon. Member to take note of that remark. [Cries of "He did not say so."] He had certainly said so, and further the hon. Member had concluded his remarks by saying that he did not wish to see men driven from their homes.

*MR. MOLTENO said he had stated that prices rose after the introduction of free trade, but he had not said that free trade was the cause of the rise in prices.

MR. COCHRANE said the hon. Member had stated the fact and it was for others to draw their own inference. Towards the end of his speech the hon. Member had deplored the fact that hundreds and thousands had been driven from their homes and obliged to seek their subsistence in foreign countries where they had a fiscal system which did not exist in this country. The hon. Member had talked about the depopulation of the Highlands and had tried to make out that that was in no sense due to free trade. He would refer him to the Report of the Commission which sat about the year 1845, when a deplorable state of things had been brought about in the kelp industry by our system of free trade. The kelp trade, since the duty was taken off glass, had failed utterly. The unfortunate people engaged in it were no longer able to make a living, and efforts were successfully made to enable them to emigrate. Many of the Colonies which they formed were still in existence in Canada and elsewhere. That was the only reference which he would make to the hon. Member's observations, but it would be seen that the greatest instance of depopulation in the Highlands was due to the failure of the kelp trade. The hon. Member talked about the land laws, but were they not similar then, when the acres of this country bore a teeming population, to what they were now? Was it due to the land laws that depopulation had taken place? He ventured to say that it had far more to do with economic causes and had nothing at all to do with legislation. Legislation had been all in our favour.

*MR. MOLTENO: There were the Enclosures Acts.

MR. COCHRANE asked what were the powers previously held? There was a quantity of waste land in the country to which no owner claimed the right or title, and power was taken to enclose this land and to bring it into cultivation for the benefit of the agricultural population.

*MR. MOLTENO said he referred to the enclosures by which the common field system was destroyed.

MR. COCHRANE said he really did not know to what Acts the hon. Member was referring, but he would not be led into a discussion on every Act that had been passed; the hon. Member would see that no discourtesy was intended, but he was not prepared to follow him into the fields which he had entered. What did this Bill propose to do? His right hon. friend who had moved an Amendment desired to restrict the Bill to those parts of Scotland in which he said that similar legislation had been a success. The objects of this Bill were fixity of tenure and the establishment of a Land Court for the Lowlands of Scotland. What benefit to any human being would result? Fixity of tenure in the Lowlands, where there was a system of leasehold, he ventured to say was not wanted. Throughout the Lowlands the practically universal system was a lease of nineteen years. Nobody in the House would say that a nineteen years lease did not give as much fixity of tenure as any tenant in the Lowlands desired to have. What was to be the operation of the Land Court? The small holdings which they proposed to set up were from an acre up to 50 acres, and in place of the negotiations between landlord and tenant, they were going to put into operation an expensive method of acquiring holdings. A Land Court was to be set up to perform between landlord and tenant what was now done by a simple procedure between them without trouble. They were going to put in operation the expensive machinery of the Land Court and to take away that system of bargaining between landlord and tenant in which he ventured to say that the tenant was often the better and more skilled bargainer. What demand was there for the Bill in the Lowlands? His hon. friend the Member for Durham had alluded to the speech made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Aberdeenshire in the Grand Committee. The hon. Member said that in his constituency at any rate there was one class that demanded this Bill—the labourers. The hon. Member opposite stated that there had been a meeting in his constituency at which a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of the Bill. He understood that at the end of the meeting those who attended were entertained to a sumptuous repast of Scottish broth and roast beef. When the hon. Member claimed that those people were unanimously in favour of the Bill he thought he was quite justified in drawing a perfectly different inference. He had information which showed a different state of things and there was no Scottish broth or roast beef in the case. A petition which he would present to-morrow had been signed by the following persons in Aberdeenshire, Kincardine, and Banffshire against this Bill: Farmers, 2,573; crofters, 853; farm servants, 1,095; merchants and tradesmen, 569; miscellaneous, 1,104; making a total of 6,194 persons in those counties who desired the House not to pass the Bill into law. What would be the result of the measure upon the labourers? Let them look at the question from the point of view of the labourers. In the first place, if in the Lowlands of Scotland they wanted to get suitable land they would have to carve it out from the larger farms which were now fully equipped with a staff of farm labourers. By placing small holders on those large farms they would displace the farm labourers, who were the right persons to till the soil, and they would put in their places shopkeepers and others who laboured under the hallucination that any man was good enough to make a farmer. Consequently the labourers would be cut out. Throughout Scotland at the present time there were some 60,000 smallholders who would come under this Bill. One of the provisions was that the tenure of those holdings not only should be fixed to the individual who was in possession at the present time, but that it should descend to his heirs and successors. As for placing agricultural labourers on the soil, every one of those small holdings would be absolutely closed to the labourer and thirled to the occupiers. With the £65,000 which had been mentioned they were to carry out a number of other things to assist agriculture. They were going to set up a Board of Agriculture of their own, assist forestry and sylviculture and he did not know how many other things. He felt sure that when the labourers really understood their true position under the Bill they would prefer to be labourers on a farm earning good wages to the uncertainty of being turned out of their present employment on the off-chance of getting a small holding. His right hon. friend had proposed that the scheme should be confined to the crofting parishes. All Scottish Members must have noticed as being very significant the absence of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty from their debates on this question. Why was that? Nobody had taken more interest in the question than the hon. Member, and he knew perfectly well that the conditions of the crofting parishes were diametrically opposite to the conditions in the Lowlands. The hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty was not silent in the Committee, because there he strongly expressed the view that the Bill should have been confined absolutely to the crofting parishes, and in that contention he had the support of those thoughtful persons who had considered this question. In 1895 Sir George Trevelyan pointed out how the claims of the crofters for legislation were on an entirely different footing from the claims of any other class in Scotland. He said—

> "The crofter had no security of tenure. In the house he had built and the farm he had improved he had no property whatever recognised by law."

What was now proposed was to take not the property, not the house which the crofter or the small landholder had built, but the farm buildings and equipments provided by the landlord and hand them over to the crofter. The Leader of the Opposition had described that as immoral. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh had said that sanctity of contracts was now an exploded theory.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh. E.) said if the hon. Member wished to quote him he hoped he would do so accurately.

MR. COCHRANE said that if he had misquoted the hon. Member he would apologise and withdraw, but he was assured that the hon. Member not only said that but repeated it, and when he was challenged on the spot he did not deny it. If the hon. Member said he was not quoting him correctly he would withdraw and apologise.

MR. McCRAE said the statement he made was something very different.

MR. COCHRANE: What did you say?

MR. McCRAE replied that what he said was that the contract was dependent upon whether the parties to the contract were free agents.

MR. COCHRANE said he frankly withdrew if the hon. Member said he had not been quoted correctly. He remembered that at the time he twitted the hon. Member in regard to his theory, and asked him if he would extend it in other directions. If he was going to set up up small farmers at the cost of the landlords, why should he not set up small shopkeepers at the cost of the larger ones? Hon. Members opposite attacked landowners, and because they possessed one form of property they were to be liable to spoliation, but the owners of other forms of property were to be free from attack. He had not heard from any hon. Gentleman opposite any argument for the proposal on the ground of justice or necessity. He had heard appeals to sentiment on the ground of arresting depopulation. What the Bill suggested would not cure that evil. Out of 28,000 crofters in Scotland, only 15,000 had had their rents fixed by the Court, and many of these had subsequently renounced their tenancies. That was not an argument why the remedy of the Crofters Acts should be extended further.

MR. THOMAS SHAW, by way of personal explanation, stated that since he had spoken he had obtained further information to the effect that, in addition to the operations he described in his speech, there was the importation of a few cattle and the erection of some huts or small houses.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanark, N.W.) said he would like to point out to the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire, who lamented rural depopulation, that this was not the only country where rural depopulation was going on. The same thing was happening in France. Hon. Members on that side of the House regretted rural depopulation as much as the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire, but they differed from him as to the efficacy of the remedy he had suggested. The hon. Member had also said that spoliation was the wrong word to use in connection with this Bill, and he instanced previous Acts in which compulsory powers had been granted by the State. Quite so, but the hon. Member forgot that this was not compulsory purchase. This was compulsory borrowing, which was a very different thing. The Lord Advocate had devoted half of his speech to pointing out that, after twenty-one years of the Crofters Act, the condition of some of the outlying islands was in a deplorable state, while the other half was a defence of the Irish Land Act of 1881. The right hon. and learned Gentleman made one statement which he was sure he would not repeat in his calmer moments. He said that the cost of the operations under the Irish Land Act had been so great that for every £1 of rent reduced there was a cost of £105 in legal expenses.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW said the statement he made had reference to the cost of appeals in connection with the alteration of rents. He said that £105 was the amount incurred for legal expenses in connection with appeals in respect of every £1 altered. It was only fair that that should be made clear.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON said it was only fair to the House to say that that statement as amended by the right hon. and learned Gentleman appeared to be received by the House with a certain amount of incredulity. The right hon. Gentleman had also read a letter from Mr. Bailey. He was not going into the right hon. Gentleman's correspondence, but he had made a speech at Inverness last autumn in which he quoted Mr. Bailey's letter. By the way, Mr. Bailey's letter referred, not to this Bill, but to the Bill which was the forerunner of the present. The reason why Mr. Bailey approved of that Bill was because it contained dual ownership as it had existed in Ireland. The Lord Advocate defended the Bill on the ground that it contained dual ownership, and the Solicitor-General said that he did not. The Lord Advocate had also referred with unqualified praise to the working of the Act of 1886.

Mr. A. DEWAR: Have any of the crofting landlords objected to it?

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON said that that did not touch the question as to whether the Act had arrested the depopulation of the Highlands. A Return presented to another place a few weeks ago stated that in 1881 the population of the crofting parishes was 342,000, and in 1901 324,000, or a decrease of 18,000. It might be said that these figures did not apply to the parishes where the Congested Districts Act was in operation. The Chamberlain of the Duke of Argyll had made an interesting return as to the population of the parishes under the Congested Districts Board. In 1871 the population was 158,000, in 1881 it was 155,000, in 1891 148,000, and in 1901 142,000. Hon. Members would see that whatever the Crofters Act had done, it had failed to check rural depopulation. The right hon. Gentleman had founded his arguments on an opinion expressed by Sheriff Brand, Chairman of the Crofters Commission, given in 1892. Sometimes the right hon. Gentleman went rather far back for his authority. In the Report of a Departmental Committee which sat last year, the Secretary of the Crofters Commission was examined. He was asked: "You cannot say that the crofting system has altogether stopped migration from the country into the town?" The answer was: "No, it has not." The same witness afterwards said that statistics showed that the depopulation of the Highlands had been quite as large since the passing of the Crofters Act as before it. But successful or not he altogether denied that the conditions under which the Crofters Act operated in the Highlands existed in other parts of Scotland. The view held by those who framed the Crofters Act, and the Lord Advocate of the day, was that this special legislation had been passed under special circumstances, and for a special purpose. The hon. and learned Member for South Edinburgh had contended that the Crofters Act was necessary in districts where not a copper was spent by the landlords on improvements; but it was no reason why it should be extended to parts of the country where the landlord did spend money on improvements. The Report of the Departmental Committee stated that experience had proved that the system of dual ownership could not be maintained under economic conditions, that it was fatal and harmful to the relations between landlord and tenant; and that the experiment might be suitable where crofting conditions prevailed, but not suitable where the ordinary conditions between landlord and tenant existed. It was said that there was a strong demand for the Bill in the Lowlands. He had seen none of it. It was opposed by the Highland and Agricultural Society and other public bodies. A meeting—what was called a great demonstration—was held at Perth on the 1st of July. It was carefully got together by a very select party who wished to get a resolution passed in favour of the provisions of this Bill. But at that meeting there was one gentleman who gave vent to an expression of his own opinion. He said that the Government had "raised against the Bill an almost solid mass of expert agricultural opinion in Scotland." If that was the foundation on which this Bill had been raised, then their labours were in vain.

And, it being half-past Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 5th August, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

The House divided:—Ayes, 263; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 373.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire

Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen, C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton underLyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Streadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,SirJohn L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish,RtHn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHnJ.A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gordon, J.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Kenyon-Slaney,RtHn.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, to leave out the words 'the date of.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out the words 'the date of.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'and,' and insert the words 'or within two miles from the holding, and by himself or his family'"—(*Mr. Sinclair*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 268; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 379.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes

Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss,E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson,Hon. C. H. W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.Sir Alex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick Georga
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles. G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish.Rt. Hon. Victor C.W
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane. Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gordon, J.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,SirBerkeley George D.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh)

Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the words 'the date of.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the word 'and,' and insert the words 'or within two miles from the holding, and by himself or his family'"—(*Mr. Sinclair*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 268; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 380.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.

Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Cent.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Badford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W.(Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A.J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J.A.(Worc.)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gordon, J.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E.C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 8, to leave out from the word 'leaseholder,' to end of line 14."

"In page 2, lines 22 and 23, to leave out the words 'their respective statutory successors,' and insert the words 'the successors of every such person in the holding, being his heirs or legatees.'"

"In page 3, line 18, to leave out the words 'immediately before,' and insert the word 'at.'"—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be further considered To-morrow.

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD (CHARGES, &c.) BILL (BY ORDER).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment proposed [23rd July], on Consideration of the Bill, as amended.

Which Amendment was—

"In page 2, to leave out lines 24 and 25."—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Question put, and agreed to.

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) moved an Amendment to Clause 9, to reduce the limit of houses not charged with inhabited house duty, and receiving a rebate on water, from £300 to £200. He stated that his object was to extend the benefit of the rebate offered in the Bill to a large class of shopkeepers and business men who, in his opinion, needed it more than those to whom it was at present granted. He reminded the House that formerly some of the water companies did grant on houses assessed under £200 a rebate of 30 per cent. This Bill did nothing for the £200 householder. The benefit was confined to the £300 householder, and gave him only 20 and in certain circumstances 30 per cent. The right hon. Gentleman stated on a former occasion that, under this Bill people were going to get water cheaper. The Bill would certainly not confer that benefit on shopkeepers and business men who used very little water, and whose premises were closed at night. It lowered the rebate, and raised the rental limit to which the rebate applied. It was proved in evidence that each clerk in an office used on an average five gallons of water a day. For 300 days this took 1,500 gallons which, at 8d. per 1,000 gallons, cost the Water Board 1s. An office or shop assessed at £200, and having ten employees, therefore used 10s. worth of water a year, and under this Bill paid £10 for it. He would have liked to see the abolition of the limit to which the rebate applied, so that all householders not paying inhabited house duty would have got the benefit. He could not see how in common justice this material benefit was to be restricted to the class who were better off than those who were not to get it. The proposal seemed to contradict all the professions of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. This rebate was very general in the provinces, and there was no limit. It covered all the people who did not pay inhabited house duty and whose business places were locked up at night. There was all the more reason why the rebate should be granted in London, where rents and rates were high, where assessments were regularly raised, and where competition was keen. He begged to move.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) in seconding the Amendment, said the section to which it referred was one which gave a rebate of 20 to 30 per cent. on the water rate to the owners of premises used only for business purposes. In the case of offices or other business premises very little water was used, and, therefore, it was exceedingly unfair that in respect of such premises the full water rate should be charged. He did not understand why an exemption should be given in the case of business offices rented at more than £300, thereby exempting from benefit the very class who ought to have it. That was an exemption which was recognised even by this Bill, but he submitted that the Bill was illogical in stopping at £300. If exemption was to be given to anybody, it should be those who occupied premises at less than £300. The charge for water rates under the Bill would bear hardly upon the small tradesman and professional man who ought to come within the rebate rather than those who were now included.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 8, to leave out the word 'three,' and insert the word 'two'"—(*Mr. Burdett-Coutts*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' stand part of the Bill."

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said it appeared to him that the idea of this Bill was not at all well understood. The position was that the Board had £3,000,000 to carry on the whole water business of London. It was quite immaterial to the Water Board how that money was collected. The Board had also to pay large interest on £50,000,000 as well as the expenses of the business. This particular clause arose in this way. It had been the custom of the New River Company to give a rebate within the City of London, while it was contended that uniformity of rating should be applied to the whole of the Water Board area. Accordingly, they included a class of property which was rated at £300. For his part he would give the water for nothing, but financially it was impossible for the Board to give more than they were giving. The recommendation in the Bill had been adopted after full debate before the Lords and Commons Committees.

SIR F. BANBURY said that he did not think that the hon. Member for Kidderminster had met the argument of the hon. Member for Westminster, that it was not fair to fix the limit at £300. All that the hon. Gentleman said was that the Water Board could not afford to make a lower limit, because they had a certain amount of money to raise irrespective of whether the payment was fair or not. The hon. Gentleman had said he would be glad to give the water for nothing, but he did not want that; they only wanted to pay what was fair, and if there was a deficit the Board could make a rate in aid which would be spread over the whole of the Metropolis. The only reason why the Board did not like a rate in aid was that they were afraid the ratepayers would say that their administration had been extravagant.

Mr. Rawlinson.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said that to his mind it was something more than amusing to find the hon. baronet the Member for the City of London, who had assisted in forcing on London this iniquitous Act, condemning the unfair terms of the Water Board's proposal and trying to get the rates reduced. Undoubtedly unfair charges were made for water to those engaged in business, and it was proposed by this Bill to continue and increase them. The whole difficulty had arisen from the late Government passing an Act to buy up the water companies at an unfair price. There ought to be some endeavour as soon as possible to make a fair charge all round for the water. Of course, the Fire Brigade paid nothing for the water they used. The difficulty was that if they reduced the price so as to compel the Water Board to go on the rates, they would be making the poor people pay for the water which the rich people used. [OPPOSITION cries of "Sit down!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite did not like to be reminded of the evil doings of the late Government.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) trusted that he would be able by what he was going to say to assist the hon. Gentleman in forming an opinion. If the Amendment were passed the poorer consumers would have to pay more than they did now, and if the deficiency could not be met in that way, a rate in aid would have to be incurred. If the Amendment were passed it would go right in the teeth of what the Committee had considered, and what the Water Board, after serious consideration of this matter, had determined to be fair and equitable to everybody.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) thought the right hon. Gentleman had mistaken the reading of the clause. The effect of the Amendment was exactly contrary to that stated by the

President of the Local Government Board. Its effect would be to give the poorer as well as the richer the benefit of the rebate.

Mr. WATERLOW (Islington, N.) said it appeared to him that the President of the Local Government Board was entirely on the wrong tack. The object of the Amendment was to benefit the poorer against the richer. The rebate was a rebate to people who occupied houses of a rental of £300, and the Amendment was that it should be a rebate to people who lived in £200 houses; therefore it was a rebate in favour of the poorer people. But the main argument against this particular Amendment was that if it were carried there might have to be a rate in aid. That argument was a fallacious argument, because the estimates for the financial year 1906–7 showed that the Water Board had made a profit of £49,493, which was a goodly sum in itself. Moreover, there was an annual growth in the revenue of the Water Board of 2 per cent., which gave them an ample margin to play with. He therefore supported the Amendment.

*Mr. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E. R., Buckrose), as a Member of the Committee, said that when they found this limit of £300 confined to London, they desired to continue it, but this being a Bill to secure uniformity, they were compelled in order to secure the continuation of that rebate which was confined to London, to extend it over the whole area. The Committee came to the conclusion that it was desirable to continue it in the City of London, and this was the only way in which it could be done. He trusted that the House in its conclusion would support the Committee in this matter.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 184; Noes, 24. (Division List No 381)

AYES.

Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W.)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gordon, J.
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John

Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thorne, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth')
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Barnard and Sir John Bethell.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Nield, Herbert
Rees, J. D.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Waterlow. D. S.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Burdett-Coutts and Mr. Rawlinson.

SIR F. BANBURY moved, in Clause 9, to leave out "twenty per centum, or more than." The New River Company, when it was in existence, in the case of offices in the City did not take the full charges allowed to them by their Act of Parliament. In the case of offices, rented at £700, £800 or £1,000 a year, where the water was only used by the clerks for washing their hands, etc., the company did not feel justified in making the full charge, and they made a reduction of 30 per cent. Then came the Water Board, and they also made a reduction of 30 per cent., but now they came to the House with a proposal for the alteration of these charges so that the remission should only be 20 per cent. What it amounted to was that they asked to make a charge of 5 per cent. on the rateable value where the New River Company had only charged about 3 per cent. This was an enormous increase, and he thought matters should remain as they were before. He begged to move.

MR. COURTHOPE seconded the Amendment, and said that by means of this proposal the cost of water in City offices would be increased from 3 to 5 per cent. on the rateable value, which meant that the amount payable was assessed upon £300 instead of £200. This proposal would inflict a large amount of hardship in the City of London. Many hon. Members seemed to think that the burden would fall upon the shoulders of the plutocrats who were well able to afford it, but that was not the case. It was said that that class would pay most of the water rate, but over 60 per cent. of the house property in the City of London was either owned or occupied by limited companies, and the burden would fall not only on the plutocrats but on the small investor. He thought it only fair to warn the Water Board that they would defeat their own purposes by taking measures of this kind, because he had been informed that in consequence of these proposals private companies were thinking of sinking wells for themselves. He thought that the Amendment would go a long way to relieve the injustice which undoubtedly would be done if the Bill was passed in its present form.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 5, line 12, to leave out the words 'twenty per centum, or more than.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. LUKE WHITE said the reason why the Committee had placed this clause in the Bill, giving a minimum rebate of 20 per cent. and a maximum of 30 per cent., was on the ground that it was absolutely necessary, in order to secure an income to the Water Board, that the 30 per cent. should not be allowed throughout the whole area. The Committee had come to the conclusion that in order to secure uniformity they should allow not less than 20 per cent., or more than 30 per cent., on this class of property, and they had to apply that to every class of property which came within the description in the whole area. Therefore, he asked the House to support the Committee. It was not a clause put in the Bill by the Water Board; it was a clause unanimously agreed upon by the Joint Committee after hearing the whole of the evidence; and, bearing in mind the instructions of the Committee and of the Water Board, that this Bill was to secure uniformity throughout the limits supplied, the Joint Committee were bound to take the course which they did when they found that in the City the water rate was 3 per cent. in some parts and in other parts it was 7½ per cent. They had increased the rate in some portion of the water area in order to secure uniformity of charge. In other portions of the area the people would, of course, receive great benefit. They could not get uniformity in such conditions as obtained without some districts paying more and other districts paying less.

Mr. BARNARD said that this Amendment struck at the root of the Bill, and he desired to associate himself with what the Member for the Buckrose division had said.

*Mr. MORTON, in reply to the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London, denied that he had said that the water companies had extorted money; he had made no such statement. What he had said was that they had made unjust and unfair charges, and that they had been purchased on that basis. But now he would like to tell the hon. Baronet that the companies had extorted money illegally for years in the City of London and elsewhere.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member ought to have answered the hon. Baronet before, when he had the opportunity.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 173; Noes, 20. (Division List No. 382.)

AYES.

Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Astbury, John Meir
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Benn, W. (Tw'r Hamlets, S. Geo.)
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bull, Sir William James
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Gordon, J.
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, O.E. (Edinburgh, Central
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rees, J.
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thorne, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Barnard and Sir John Bethell.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Forster, Henry William
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Nield, Herbert
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Courthope.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey) said that he brought forward this Amendment purely as a matter of principle, and he would state his views very shortly, as he recognised the apathy of the House concerning the question. The Amendment sought to do for the consumer who took water by meter exactly what the Bill had done for those who received a domestic supply. It sought to give every man who took water by meter a fixed price of 8d. per 1,000 gallons, which was the sum of money that it cost the Water Board to obtain and supply water. There was neither any profit nor any loss occasioned to the ratepayer by selling water at that price. The scale inserted in the Bill sold water to certain people—borough councils, Royal parks, Government Departments, railway companies, and all the large traders—at a sum considerably below cost price. Practically speaking, the ratepayers of London were asked to subsidise the larger traders to the extent of £20,000 a year, the borough councils to the extent of £11,000 a year, the Royal parks to the extent of some thousands of pounds a year, and it also subsidised all the Government Departments which insisted upon having water at that cheap rate. It was perfectly true that the trading companies had a scale which gave preferential charges to various people, but they were trading companies, and as such they had a right to make what charge they liked. The Water Board, however, was a public authority giving practically a municipal supply, and the case therefore was entirely different from that of the trading companies. He maintained that a municipal authority had no right to make any differential charge between one consumer and another. Therefore, when he found the Government of the day backing up the Water Board in giving these subsidies at the expense of the general body of London ratepayers he felt he could not do otherwise than enter his protest against their action. Roughly speaking, it might be said that two-thirds of the water given to London was used for domestic purposes and one-third only for trade purposes. It had always been said that the trader had been charged excessively in order to reduce the rates for the domestic supply, but the statistics of the Water Board proved that statement to be an absolute fallacy. They proved, as a matter of fact, that the consumer who used water for purely domestic purposes paid 8d. per 1,000 gallons, whereas the trader only paid 7·14d. The effect was that practically all through the traders of London had received a heavy subsidy out of the pockets of the people who used the water for domestic purposes alone, and he could not but believe that the Government was ill-advised in forcing the proposed scale upon London. The small trader would be sacrificed to the big trader; he would have the scale of charges for the water he used considerably increased. In the past the highest charge he had had to pay had been 9d., but according to this Bill he would have to pay from 8½d. to 1s. per 1,000 gallons. It was a grossly unjust and unfair scale to be proposed in any Bill submitted to Parliament in the interests of the people. A municipal supply ought on no account to allow differential charges between various people in its own area, and it was because it did so in the present case that he felt it his duty to move this Amendment.

*MR. MORTON seconded the Amendment. He thought that they ought to have an answer to the speech made by the mover. There was no doubt at all that the proper way of charging for water was by meter. It was unfair that a higher charge should be made for the domestic supply in order to make up for the loss that was apparently going to occur somewhere else. If any defence was possible of the proposal that a preference should be shown, and that one person should get water cheaper than another, perhaps the representative of the Government, who was in charge of the Bill now, would tell the House what it was. This was a great question, affecting four, five, or six millions of people, and although they were forced by the Government to discuss it at that late hour that was not a reason why matters should not be properly gone into. and considered. He trusted that the Government would give the House some explanation as to why there should be a difference of charge between the domestic supply and the trade supply.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 8, to leave out lines 8, 9, 10 and 11, and to insert the words 'The charge for any supply furnished by the Board under the last preceding subsection of this section shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, be the fixed rate of eight pence per thousand gallons.' "—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

MR. WATERLOW said he had an Amendment on the Paper as follows—

"In page 8, line 11, to leave out from the word 'say,' to end of line 27, and to insert the words 'When the quarterly consumption of water does not exceed fifty thousand gallons, nine pence; when exceeding fifty thousand and not exceeding one hundred thousand gallons, eight pence; when exceeding one hundred thousand and not exceeding two hundred thousand gallons, seven pence; when exceeding two hundred thousand gallons, six pence.' "

He understood, however, that an assurance had been given by the hon. Member in charge of the Bill that an Amendment by the hon. Member for Limehouse would be accepted, and he would not therefore proceed further with his own Amendment.

MR. BARNARD said it would perhaps be convenient to say on behalf of the Water Board that, acting on the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board, who had taken a great deal of interest in the matter, the Board had decided not to offer any opposition to the Amendments in the name of the hon. Member for Limehouse.

MR. W. PEARCE said he was happy to say, as the representative of the Water Board had just told the House, that through the good offices of the President of the Local Government Board these Amendments were to be accepted. They effected modification, though only a partial one, of a new scale of charges which would cast a very heavy burden on the manufacturers of London. He could not say that he felt fully satisfied with the result, but, having failed to persuade the Water Board to accept the traders' case, it was thought to be the wisest course by the traders to agree to the compromise that was offered. There were many natural disadvantages which London could not escape from, and for many reasons it was very difficult to carry on extensive industrial operations in the metropolis. The cost of fuel was higher in London than in almost any other part of the country. There were also the high rates and many other disadvantages. The traders of London, therefore, viewed even the partial increase which the modified scale would impose on them with great distrust. They thought that the Water Board would have shown much more worldly wisdom if they had avoided throwing any portion of the extra charge on the traders of London, who already had sufficient disadvantages to contend with.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 8, line 13, to leave out the word 'twenty-five,' and to insert the word 'fifty.'"

"In page 8, line 13, to leave out the words 'one shilling,' and to insert the words 'eleven pence.'"

"In page 8, to leave out lines 14 and 15."

Mr. Waterlow.

"In page to 8, leave out lines 25, 26 and 27, and to insert: 'When exceeding one million gallons and not exceeding three million gallons, eight pence; when exceeding three million gallons and not exceeding five million gallons, seven pence; when exceeding five million gallons, six pence and one-eighth of a penny.'"

"In page 8, line 29, to leave out the words 'twenty-five shillings,' and to insert the words 'twenty-two shillings and eleven pence.'"—(*Mr. W. Pearce.*)

Amendments agreed to.

*MR. NIELD said there was no doubt at all that a settlement had been arrived at between the traders and the Water Board. The traders had agreed to the compromise, being the best terms they could get under the present circumstances; but the great body of ratepayers were dissatisfied with the arrangement. The President of the Local Government Board, speaking on the Motion to recommit the Bill, admitted that these charges were the maximum charges, and said he hoped that in the future the Water Board would be able to see their way to reduce them. The Amendment he desired to move was not before the Committee, and it could not be said to be already prejudged. The Amendment recognised that if the authorised charges were high, and pressed unduly upon the payers of the rate, there should be a revision at the expiration of five years if upon a *prima facie* case being made out by any county or local authority within the area of supply the Local Government Board should think fit to authorise an inquiry. He was careful in proposing it in the terms he did. It was on behalf of urban areas largely occupied by the working classes. In his own division of Middlesex, though it was supposed to be one of the better-class divisions, so far as the type of house was concerned, he might say for the information of Members below the gangway, there were thousands of houses which would be affected by the Bill: he was informed there were no less than 1,700 whose assessments were £30 and under. That was speaking from the point of view of the domestic supply in one part of Middlesex. There were other divisions poorer where the operation of the Act would have a still harder effect. All that he desired to do was to say that, at the expiration of five years, the Local Government Board might, upon representations made to them by a county or local authority affected by the Bill, if they were of opinion that the authority had made out a case to their satisfaction, direct an inquiry to be held, at which the Water Board would be represented, and should show cause why they should not reduce their rate. The Amendment might have the effect of correcting what was now thought to be a great injustice. The Water Board now claimed to stand a loss of income of £21,000 a year by equalisation of rate. That decrease of £21,000 was arrived at in this way. London would suffer to the extent of £17,000, and Middlesex to the extent of nearly £5,000. Essex and Surrey, by reason of their present heavy charges, would benefit to the extent of £43,000. The Water Board said it was necessary to have the difference made up, and they proposed to equalise the rates in this way. They had taken no account of the ever-increasing areas which were taking water supply. They were paying not the least attention to the wonderful increase in suburban districts in the counties which bordered on the County of London. At the expiration of five years there was every reason to believe that, if the rate of building went on in anything like the same proportion, tremendous areas would be added to the Board's sphere, and become rateable on increased incomes. Factories were rapidly moving into the suburbs also, and they would add to the revenue by the additional water which they would take. Such considerations had apparently not been taken into account, and it was therefore only reasonable to suggest that at the expiration of five years from now the necessity for a revision might, in view of the additional income which would arise in the ordinary course of business, be considered. The Board declared that they did not want to make profits, and admittedly they had every reason to expect an enormous increase in the number of consumers both by measure and for domestic purposes. If therefore from all parts of the House they accepted the Bill as being required by the present needs of the Water Board, he could not for the life of him see why, after the admission of the President of the Local Government Board that these were maximum charges, there should not be a provision enabling any one of the county councils at the end of five years, if they thought they could make a good case, to come to the Local Government Board, and ask for an inquiry with a view to having their charges revised, and the burden which he thought might prove onerous, and which at that time they might show had proved onerous, relieved. It might after five years be shown that by reason of the additional areas of supply the Board were not only able to pay their way by reason of their additional income, but to make a reduction on the high charges. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 32, at the end, to insert the words: '(5) Provided always that, if at any time after the expiration of five years from the passing of this Act the council of any administrative county which, or any part of which, is within the limits of supply, or the local authority of any borough or district which, or any part of which, is within the limits of supply shall make a representation to the Local Government Board that the prices authorised by this Act to be charged for a supply of water for domestic purposes or by measure ought to be altered the Local Government Board, after such inquiry as they may think fit, may make an order varying the prices which the Board may charge for a supply of water for domestic purposes or by measure, or substituting other prices in lieu thereof, and the prices so varied or substituted shall have effect on and after such day as may be mentioned in the order as if they had been stated in this Act, and the prices for the time being in force may be altered in like manner at any time after the expiration of any or every period of five years after they were last altered.' "—(*Mr. Nield.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*MR. JOHN BURNS said that practically the hon. Member in his Amendment proposed that at the expiration of five years the Local Government Board might be appealed to to hold an inquiry as to the reasonableness of the Water Board charges. It was an exceptional form of suggestion. There was no precedent for it. The Local Government Board did not want it. If it were adopted he thought it would be accepted as a precedent for other water concerns and other municipal undertakings which would look to the Board to be appointed as the tribunal to judge between them and their constituents. He did not think the Amendment was necessary. The hon. Gentleman forgot that the Water Board was a public authority, that it was not to its interest to impose unreasonable charges upon that section of consumers which was least able to bear it. He also forgot that if there was anyone who would be influenced and perhaps warned by that debate it was the Water Board itself, and he might rely upon it that that Board had already taken the necessary lesson from the suggestions that had been made and the criticisms that had been offered. The hon. Member might rely upon this also that if the revenue of the Board was larger than it apprehended, the Board would from the increased revenue do what every municipal authority did under similar circumstances. They would relieve the condition of the worst first and they would do their best to make their supply as popular and as attractive as was consistent with their making a small margin of profit. Towards the carrying of that out the hon. Member might rely upon it the Local Government Board, without instruction from that House and without that Amendment, would exercise what reasonable pressure it could upon the Water Board. The Local Government Board did not need any cast iron Amendment for such a purpose, and as President of the Board which was to be used, and which ought not to be used as the Amendment proposed, he asked the House to reject the Amendment.

*Mr. MORTON said he was extremely sorry the President objected to the Amendment. He said there was no precedent for it; but if he (Mr. Morton) remembered rightly, in most of the electric light undertakings there was a right of appeal to the Board of Trade to get the price charged altered. That applied, he thought, to undertakings by municipal authorities as well as companies, and he could not understand why the President did not accept that precedent. There might be many reasons why at the end of five years an inquiry should be wanted. The Water Board, which as he had understood the right hon, Gentleman never had much faith in, might be wasting their income. They might be extravagant with salaries and in many other ways and an inquiry, which generally they understood the right hon. Gentleman did not object to, would expose matters. No undertaking—not even the Local Government Board—was always right. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his decision and do for the water companies what the Government and Parliament had done with regard to the electric light undertakings.

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. BOWLES moved in page 9, line 37, to leave out the words 'Board so determine they may,' and to insert the words, 'builder shall in writing so require the Board shall.'" He moved with some diffidence because he thoroughly recognised and agreed that a Bill of that kind was not quite in the position of an ordinary public Bill, and they ought to show great respect for the decisions of the Committee which had considered the matter and to any conclusions at which they might have arrived. Having heard all the evidence the Committee were in a better position than they could be, but he had some reason to believe, and hon. Gentlemen who were on the Committee and who spoke for it would contradict him if he was wrong, that really this clause as it now stood did not represent what was the intention of the Committee upon this important point. The point was simple. For a long time builders in London had been treated upon lines which they considered rather hard, and they represented this before the Committee. The Committee, he understood, took the view quite clearly that something at any rate ought to be done to meet the grievance of which the builders complained. The clause was introduced, as he was informed, in order to put the builder in the same position as, in no other position than, any other trader in London in regard to water. He submitted that the first part of it would amply carry out all that had ever been suggested. In other words, as far as that was concerned, the builder was put in the same position as the occupier, and was entitled to have his water by meter. That was perfectly satisfactory, but the clause went on to make that provision meaningless and ridiculous, for it went on to provide that though the builder was to be permitted to have his water by meter, if the Board otherwise determined they could insist on supplying him at a rate not exceeding 7s. per 100,000 gallons. In other words they might put him back in the position which he had held heretofore, of which he had complained, and which complaint the Committee desired to do away with. The House would see there was a serious case for that Amendment, and he hoped it would be considered. The intention merely was to put the builder into the position occupied by every other trader. Under that Bill every other trader throughout London was entitled to pay by measure for such water as he used, according to the amount he did use. To apply to the builder the first part of the clause, and to withdraw that first part from him by the second part was so palpably and openly contradictory that it must have been due to some mistake on the part of the Committee which the House should be asked to set right. It was a perfectly reasonable position that he had taken up. It was fair that the builder should pay for what he had, but it was unfair that he should be forced to pay for more than he had, and at a different rate from other traders in the City. He hoped that both the House and the hon. Members who served on the Committee would on consideration not object to the Amendment.

MR. RAWLINSON seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 9, line 37, to leave out the words 'Board so determine they may,' and insert the words 'builder shall in writing so require the Board shall'—(*Mr. Bowles*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*MR. LUKE WHITE said the Joint Committee took a considerable amount of evidence from the Master Builders Association, and also heard counsel on the question of the supply of water, and found that up to the present time builders had no right whatever to ask the Water Board for a supply of water. Builders, therefore, had been obliged to pay whatever demands had been made by the Water Board to a very large extent. The Committee was agreed that the Builders Association had a ground for complaint, and that they ought to be put in a position in which if they required a supply of water they should be put in the same position as any other traders and be entitled to demand that supply. Up to the present time the charge for water supply for building purposes had been a percentage of the amount of the contract, and after hearing the evidence and the counsel for the Water Board and counsel for the Builders Association, the Committee came to the conclusion that the Water Board should be entitled to charge a percentage, or, with the alternative, should charge according to the scale for supply by measure. He thought that that was a fair compromise. The builders were in a much better position now, for they were in a position to demand water and to know exactly what they were going to pay for it. In entering into a contract if they paid for the supply of water on the percentage in that clause they would know the exact amount they would be made to pay for the water they obtained, and they would know also that they might arrange with the Water Board to take their supply by measure in the same way that any other trader could. No mistake had been made, neither had there been any difference of opinion on the Joint Committee with regard to the point that had been raised. They were of opinion that that was a reasonable clause which the builders ought to accept.

Amendment negatived.

DR. COOPER moved an Amendment which sought to make it compulsory on the Water Board to rate the owner of all weekly and monthly property instead of the tenant. The Amendment affected the greater portion of property in London. Almost everybody in weekly and monthly property paid the water rate with the rent, but he had known a good many instances where the tenant had paid his water rate through his rent for a long period, yet the owner had not paid the water company. The consequence had been that the water of the house had been cut off, or a distraint had been levied on the tenant, though as a matter of fact he had practically paid his water rate through his rent during the whole of the period. He had no desire to leave it to the discretion of the Water Board to allow that condition of things to be continued. He wished to make it compulsory that the Water Board should rate the owner of weekly or monthly property and not the tenant.

Amendment not seconded.

Mr. WATERLOW moved, on Clause 29, "to leave out the words' Royal parks or gardens,' and to insert the words ' parks, gardens or open spaces of all kinds and descriptions belonging to public authorities.'" He thought parks, gardens or open spaces belonging to public authorities should all be placed on the same terms. It seemed to him that that was only fair and reasonable, and he hoped the promoters of the Bill and the House would accept the Amendment, for there seemed no just reason why Royal parks should have an advantage over other open spaces and parks.

Mr. MORTON seconded.

Mr. BARNARD said he wished to explain in one word how the position arose. The Water Board were not in any way voluntary movers in that direction but were prompted by the Treasury. They received a letter from the Treasury which caused them to put the provision in the Bill. As far as the Water Board was concerned they left it entirely to the discretion of the House to do what they thought to be the best in the matter.

*Mr. JOHN BURNS said that whatever the Water Board might be inclined to do in the matter there was one Government Department, the Treasury, which had a right to be heard. The Treasury would take strong exception to any proposal which would affect the operation of the section so far as the Royal parks were concerned and he thought their views ought to be considered.

*Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS thought it would have been showing more consideration towards the House if the President of the Local Government Board had told them why the Treasury took exception to the proposal. He had listened to the right hon. Gentleman and to the hon. Member who represented the Water Board as they opposed Amendment after Amendment on the ground that they wished to establish uniformity of charges in the Bill, but, as he had himself shown on other occasions, the Bill reeked with inequality. It charged a man in the country £3, and a man in London £5, for the same quantity of water to the same class of house; it gave a rebate to the man who paid £300, but not to the man who paid £200; and it made concessions to the Royal parks, and denied them to other parks. He cordially supported the Amendment.

Dr. COOPER said the Royal parks were maintained out of the taxes of the country, and he could see no reason why the Government should claim that those parks should be exempt from paying the proper charge for water. He believed that the Water Board had strongly resisted that clause, and that they had only given way under compulsion. The Treasury had asked and demanded that the water for the Royal parks should be delivered at 6d. per 1,000 gallons, or at a rate which was 2d. cheaper than that paid by other consumers. He believed the hon. Member for Kidderminster had a letter in his pocket, which he could read to the House, in which the Treasury had informed the Water Board that unless they consented to that iniquitous charge they would withhold, or cause to be withheld, the Royal assent. He challenged the hon. Member for Kidderminster to read the letter so that the House might see the kind of pressure put on the Water Board, not only by the Treasury, but by the Local Government Board and by the President of the Board of Trade.

Mr. WOOD (Glasgow, St. Rollox) said the Amendment which had been proposed would not in the slightest degree interfere with the position taken up by the Treasury. If the Water Board could afford to supply the Royal parks with water at 6d. per 1,000 gallons it could afford to supply the County Council parks and other parks belonging to public authorities at the same price. That was a matter which he understood the Water Board was prepared to leave to the House. It was not an unreasonable proposal they were making, for large manufacturers were to be supplied at 6½d., and if that was so, why should not the parks belonging to the municipalities of London be supplied at 6d? This was one of the difficulties caused by the divorce of the Water Board from the municipal authority. The case they were discussing would not have arisen but for that divorce. If they did not obtain the security which that Amendment would give them they would be left entirely at the mercy of the Water Board, who could charge them exactly what they pleased.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Dr. MACNAMARA, Camberwell, N.) said he did not think there was any need at that late hour to go into the question of the constitution of the Water Board. The question they had to settle was whether the word "Royal" should stand in Clause 29. A letter had been received from the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to the effect that water should be supplied to the Royal parks at 6d. per 1,000 gallons. As far as he was concerned, it seemed to him that if the House of Commons liked to extend the arrangement to all other parks and public gardens in the metropolis, the Treasury would still be secure. If the Royal parks had their supply at 6d. per 1,000 gallons, he thought it was in the public interest that all parks and gardens should have it at the same rate.

MR. RAWLINSON said that various references had been made to a letter from the Treasury to the hon. Member who was in charge of the Bill. Those who wished to amend the Bill had been met in the case of every other Amendment by a statement from the hon. Member in charge to the effect that the Water Board could not make any Amendment in the charges fixed under the Bill because the finances of the Board would not allow of its being done. The House had been told that the cost of the water to the Water Board and its distribution amounted to at least 8d. per 1,000 gallons, and yet they had here a clause which suggested that there should be preferential treatment for the Royal parks which would result in providing them with a supply of water under cost price. The public were to pay for that preferential treatment. They were told by the hon. Member in charge of the Bill that the clause was not put in with his sanction or at his instigation, but in consequence of a letter from the Treasury to the Water Board containing statements the nature of which had not been divulged to the House. No one had said anything in favour of the Amendment except the hon. Members who moved and seconded it and the hon. Member who had just spoken. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board said that as long as the Treasury were secured he had no objection to that preferential treatment being extended to the other London parks and gardens as well. They were, however, supposed to be dealing in this matter as a business assembly, and he wished to ask whether the House really thought they were justified in voting away public money at that hour of the night in the way they were asked to do under this clause. He ventured to say without fear of contradiction that if any private company had brought such a clause before the House at that time of the night they would not have received the support of the House for one instant. He hoped the House would not agree to the proposal that a large supply of water should be given below cost price when the promoters of the Bill at the same time found it absolutely impossible to make any other concession, however desirable it might be.

MR. BARNARD asked permission to offer a word of personal explanation. He did not mean his remark to apply to anything except the Royal parks, and it would not apply beyond those parks.

Question, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

*Mr. JOHN BURNS moved, "In page 15, line 9, at end, to add the words 'provided that, notwithstanding anything contained in this section, the water supply shall not be cut off from any market gardener's premises without giving seven days' previous notice.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Dr. COOPER moved to leave out Clause 33. This clause, he said, gave increased power to the Water Board to recover its rent over and above any power which was given to the private companies. The water companies had the power of cutting off the water and of levying a distraint, and the Water Board was now seeking additional power to enable them to take a ratepayer into court and imprison him if a distraint was not satisfied. He was sorry to see the Water Board trying to get a clause passed continuing to deal with civil debt by imprisonment, and as he was strongly opposed to such a proceeding he had moved the omission of the clause.

Mr. MORTON seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 15, line 10, to leave out Clause 33."—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

*Mr. NIELD said he should like it to be put on record that he was prepared, if he had been called upon, to move his Amendment to the Amendment submitted by the President of the Local Government Board as follows: "After the word 'premises' to insert the words 'or from premises used as a laundry and receiving a supply for other than domestic purposes.'" He regretted that owing to the misunderstanding the Amendment had been pass over.

Bill to be read the third time.

COUNCIL OF INDIA BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

*Mr. C. J. O'DONNELL said that this Bill was read a second time at about one o'clock on the previous morning, and as Amendments could not be put down until after the Second Reading it was impossible for them to appear on the Paper in time for the present discussion, which was a great disadvantage. He did not hand his Amendments in then, but he believed that other hon. Members had done so. The Committee was in the position of knowing that a number of Amendments were to be moved and yet they had not a shadow of idea what those Amendments were. He ventured to say that that was entirely contrary to the ordinary practice of the House, and that the members of the Committee had a perfect right to know what the business was which would be laid before them for consideration. The Council of India Bill was the only Indian Bill of the year, and he considered that it had been dealt with very inadequately owing to the hour at which it was brought on for discussion. On the ground that the Amendments which were to be moved were not before the Committee, he begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Sir F. BANBURY seconded.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chancellor do report Progress and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) said that it had been understood, he thought, on both sides of the House that they should if possible take the Council of India Bill in Committee that night. He would remind his hon. friend that it was perfectly usual at a late period of the session such as that to proceed somewhat rapidly from stage to stage in a Bill, and that was his only excuse for pressing the Committee to proceed with the Bill that night. The Amendments, so far as he had seen them, were certainly worth considering, but he thought those that were in order could be discussed in a very moderate quantity of time. Having regard to all the circumstances, he hoped that his hon. friend would not persevere with the Motion for the adjournment of the debate.

*MR. MORTON said he really thought that they ought to have the Amendments on the Paper. It was only on the previous night that the Government had to give way because they had not got a Bill reprinted, and this was another instance where Members of the House were entitled to have their wishes respected. If Members were willing to stay and do the business properly after seeing the Amendments on the Paper in the ordinary way, then the Government ought to be quite willing to accept the Motion and let the Amendments be printed. Members ought to have a fair and honest chance to do the business of the House properly by being given an opportunity of seeing and considering the nature of the Amendments proposed.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL moved to leave out from the words 'consist of' to the end of the clause, and to insert the words 'fifteen members of whom not more than eight shall have held salaried appointments under the Government of India in the civil or military services of the Crown.'" The reason he moved was that under the original Act of 1858 the number of members of Council was fifteen, of whom it was intended that eight should be men who had experience in India, the remaining seven being independents who were not entirely chained down by the effects of official service. His desire was to secure for the Secretary of State what he might call an independent Council. At present the Council was made up of ex-officials. There were two independent members—the Commercial member and the Financial member. These were simply towers of strength to the Secretary of State. They came into the Council unbiassed, while the other members of the body, distinguished men—none more distinguished in many respects —had all the peculiarities of officials who had spent thirty, forty, or more years of their life in the same groove and who were driving the Secretary of State into that groove at the present minute. He moved the Amendment with the intention of saving the Secretary of State from being the victim of a mere official coterie, that he might have seven advisers who were independents in the right sense of the word.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out from the words 'consist of' to the end, and to insert the words 'fifteen members of whom not more than eight shall have held salaried appointments under the Government of India in the civil or military services of the Crown.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. MORLEY said he was afraid he must persist in being the victim of those gentlemen who, unlike the hon. Gentleman, were ready to sacrifice all their faculties of independence. They had had full justice done to them in a tolerably caustic and effective way by the Member for Montgomery Burghs. He did not know that an ex-official was not a fit person to be put on the Council of India. That was what his hon. friend's contention amounted to.

MR. O'DONNELL said he desired the Secretary of State should have eight of the fifteen members officials.

MR. MORLEY said his hon. friend really left out of sight the considerations which were in the mind of Parliament when the Council of India was created. He was not going to labour the matter at that time, but he would remind the House that the object of setting up the Council of India was to surround the Secretary of State with advisers who were men of great experience in the actual administration of India and in the conditions of Indian society. To limit the element of experienced men was, in his view, to frustrate the very objects for which the Council of India existed. He therefore opposed the Amendment.

*Mr. SMEATON regretted the inconsiderate way in which the Government had treated the Bill. It was a most important Bill, dealing with constitutional questions, and he did not think it was right that it should be relegated to an exhausted House sitting at an hour when every Member was tired both in body and in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will please confine himself to the Amendment.

Mr. SMEATON said he supported the Amendment most heartily. His first remark was that the right hon. Gentleman appeared to be under a misapprehension with regard to his own Council. In 1858, the Council was constituted in the proportion of eight to seven—eight being members appointed by the Queen, and seven by the Board of Directors. The seven members appointed by the Board of Directors were non-officials. The eight appointed by the Queen in Council were officials. The Council so composed proved amply useful, and had the best results for the time it lasted—until 1869, when it was reconstituted. Apart altogether from the question of the Amendment being a reversion to the previous constitution, he would like to point out that the old Council had the cardinal virtue of containing a strong, stalwart, independent, non-official minority, and they all knew what a powerful influence such a minority could exert, particularly in the case of the right hon. Gentleman himself, who was not personally acquainted with India, and had to rely on his advisers. The right hon. Gentleman always heard the voice and opinions of officials; rarely had he the chance of hearing the views of others. He was too much advised by officials who were, from their habit of mind—a habit of mind acquired by twenty-five years of subservience to superiors—unable, however willing they might be, to appreciate the non-official, outside view of things. They had been taught to do what they were told, and had no soul or mind of their own, except to do exactly what they were bid. When they came home it was very unlikely they could altogether get rid of this particular characteristic, and the chances were they would go on in the same way that they had done in India. The virtue of the non-official element was that it introduced into the Council the quality of independence; and one point of importance to which he would like to draw the right hon. Gentleman's attention was that under the Act of 1858, which was not at the present time repealed, a majority of the votes of the Council could influence powerfully the financial administration of India; and it was to that particular branch of administration in India that he thought the earnest attention of the House should be drawn. Practically everything in India, as his right hon. friend well knew, depended on finance. It was the finance of India that had brought India into the condition in which it was. It was the excessive extravagance and the excessive taxation that had brought into India at the present moment the unrest which existed, and he thought any measure which could give the Secretary for India, so to speak, a strong *locus* in the financial administration of India—a powerful informing and checking agency at his elbow—would be of immense value to him. He pointed out that there were three clauses in the Act of 1858 under which a strong unofficial minority would be able to be of immense help to the Secretary of State. Clause 41 was as follows—

> "The expenditure of the revenues of India in India and elsewhere shall be subject to the control of the Secretary of State and no appropriation or grant of such revenues shall be made without the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council."

If there was a strong substantial minority of seven well-informed independent men, the chances were that the Secretary of State, if his attention was drawn to anything like excessive taxation or extravagance in administration, or to wild-cat projects of an arrogant Viceroy, like the invasion of Tibet—the chances were that the Secretary of State would be much more likely to cast his vote with that independent minority than with the official majority which would go along the old bureaucratic lines. The next matter in regard to which the minority would have great power was contained in Section 49—

> "All powers of borrowing are to be exercised with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council."

Exactly the same result would follow. The Secretary of State would probably be very much influenced by the opinion of independent men of finance. These men would understand the local position because they must by law have had a residence of at least ten years in India, and they would be able to give the Secretary advice and strengthen him in his desire to check the extravagant borrowing that had been going on for years in India. Last of all, he would draw their attention to the words of Section 55—

> "Except in preventing or repelling invasion the revenues of India shall not be used to defray the expense of military operations beyond the external frontiers of India."

If there was one crime more than another of which the Government of India and the late Conservative Administration in this country had been guilty in recent years it was the crime of the invasion of Thibet. That was a moral offence, a political offence, and a financial offence, and he maintained that if the Secretary for India had had, in his Council, seven men of independent views, courage, and local Indian experience, who understood the exact political condition of India, that invasion would never have been sanctioned, and the enormous expenditure to which it gave rise would never have been incurred. He therefore said that on every ground, moral, political and financial, this Amendment to give to the Secretary of State a strong and independent minority, not bound by official traditions, not men who had been all their lives taught merely to do as they were told, ought to be supported. He had himself been taught, not always successfully perhaps, to do what he was told in the same way, and he had had some difficulty in getting rid of the idea. He found sometimes even the Whips in this House acted on the Indian doctrine that an official should have no mind of his own. He maintained that a strong body of men of the kind he had described, who, as the law required that they should have at least ten years experience in India, would have local experience, local knowledge, and knowledge of politics and finance in India, would strengthen the hands of the right hon. Gentleman in doing what he considered, and what the right hon. Gentleman considered, to be his duty to India.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said any Member of the House who had been an official in India was the best judge of the condition of mind in which he left that service. It was not for him to speak of the condition of mind of his hon. friend, who had himself explained his own condition of mind. He sympathised with him that, having been chastised with official whips in India, he had come home from what he described as semi-servile conditions to be driven by Government Whips—he would not call them scorpions—at home. For his own part he did not at all recognise the picture drawn of submission amounting to servility on the part of the public servants in India. But really the Amendment, if accepted, would not make any great alteration in the Bill, for if a minority of six was not sufficient to prevent crimes, such as the invasion of Thibet, to accept for the moment the hon. Member's picturesque nomenclature, a minority of seven would not do it. He really could not see that the net result of making the minority seven instead of six would be other than that the taxpayers of India would have to provide an extra £1,000 a year for the extra man in the minority. That was the only effect the Amendment would have. He hoped hon. Members who had heard his hon. friend talk about the finances of India in terms which he altogether refused to accept as bearing any resemblance to the facts, would remember what Sir M. Hicks Beach said, some three years ago, to the effect that the finances of India were far better managed, and in a far better condition than the finances of England. The question they had to consider was whether the Amendment would only have the effect of making the taxpayers of India pay more. It was no use bringing in Lord Curzon—his name like King Charles's head seemed to come into every speech by the Indian Members and he and all his works were always condemned. He (Mr. Rees) had always dissociated himself from these too comprehensive and ready condemnations, but the merits of Lord Curzon's administration in no way affected the question they were considering. He deprecated raising personal matters like the success or otherwise of Lord Curzon which were not in the slightest degree relevant, and indeed the denial of all merit to that distinguished Viceroy did not argue a very dispassionate or discriminating survey of the situation.

*SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said there were other considerations than those to which hon. Members had already adverted. India was made up of great provinces with varied languages, different customs, and immense areas, with numbers of officers working there on different lines. If the Secretary of State was to be properly advised he must have representatives of the great provinces to help him, one at least for each great province to represent the affairs of 50,000,000 60,000,000, or 80,000,000? Where better than in the Civil Service would he find the men competent to give advice. It was, therefore, he thought, a good custom that civil servants from those parts should be found at the end of their career helping the Secretary of State with their advice at Westminster. After all it was those officials who travelled all over the districts of the provinces, who served from low offices to high ones, and got experience. He admitted the great value of outsiders, gentlemen engaged in trade and commerce, who brought a special kind of knowledge into the great work, but, after all, they had not been brought into such wide contact with the people in those broad areas, nor as a general rule had they done as much in the way of learning the languages and customs of the people. That was one reason why they should not lightly interfere with the present construction of the council at Westminster. On the question of the official mind he would like to say something, having had for many years a good deal to do with officials. He need not apologise, having been an official himself. He would admit that officials, like any other class, got a peculiar intellectual bias. A friend once said to him, talking about the difference between Judge and jury, that a Judge, however qualified, could not get away from himself, and if he were to be constantly a judge of fact, he would be judging with that peculiar bias which he must acquire as he went on, but which he could not see though his friends saw it. He admitted that officials might have their views influenced by official training, might be inclined sometimes to red tape, but these defects were quite different from what was mean by want of independence, and he claimed for the public services in India a great deal of regard and sympathy for the natives. It was quite true that many of them had had to work under a system of executive subordination, but the very large areas over which they had to exercise their own judgment prevented anything like a slavish tendency of mind. There were many officials in India who were not under influence or orders from the Government, or anyone else, like the learned Judges who were charged by Parliament with the impartial administration of justice between the Crown and the people. No one would contend that such lofty duties tended to make the mind servile to the powers that be, From the ranks of that high and learned judiciary, the Council of the Secretary of State had often been recruited. Besides those again there were the military men, so the Council was a most varied collection of public servants. He did not undervalue the special qualities of the non-official members brought in, their familiar knowledge of business, of trade, of commerce, and of banking, which no public servant could have. That class came into close touch with the commercial classes of the people with whom the officials had less to do, and in this way the fluctuations of trade, the relations of capital to the industries of India, and such like things, got fair discussion in Council. They ought to get on the Council as much varied ability as they possibly could, and if the Secretary of State really meant to bring in natives of India to help him with their practical knowledge, they would have a still more valuable quality introduced into the Council, and one which they had not there yet. However much a man, whether British or native, might know one part of India he could not know all parts. In the world of natives there were immense depths, too deep for us to sound, but far more familiar to the natives, and it was in that respect that the Council at Westminster ought to be strengthened with a native member or two. They must leave a great deal to the responsible Minister of the Crown, and not tie him down with restrictions on the exercise of this important patronage.

*Mr. LUPTON, in supporting the Amendment, said that he had not one word to say in criticism or disparagement of the Council of India. No doubt they were men of independence of action, of experience and knowledge, but for all that the result was bad. There could be little doubt that India was the worst governed country in the world. That was the result he had come to after trying to learn during the last few years what the conditions really were, and that result was supported by a great deal of literature. He had tried to elicit information in contradiction of what he had read on the subject, but had not succeeded. He had tried to get information from the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs. He had tried to get the hon. Member to contradict what he had read about India, but he did not, and instead he admitted that the average income of the people of India was between ½d. and 1d. a day.

The CHAIRMAN asked the hon. Member in supporting the Amendment to confine his observations to it.

*Mr. MORTON said he would not detain the House long, but he did not think that anyone ought to complain if they spent a few minutes in considering a matter which was of the greatest importance, bearing in mind their responsibilities towards the three hundred million or so people in India. It was unfortunate that that Bill was not brought forward earlier in the session so that they might have had more and reasonable time to consider it. He entirely disagreed with the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs. He did not believe the hon. Member thoroughly understood the matter. Hon. Members did not seem to be astonished on hearing him say that. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Stirlingshire when he suggested, not that they could undo the errors that had been committed, but, that they might, by wisely appointing proper persons on the Council, in future avoid them. That was what was proposed. He knew the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs did not understand that. He would be glad to know that his right hon. friend was going to have charge of India for all time, but that was impossible, and they had to provide for the state of things when the right hon. Gentleman was obliged to give up office. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman would, perhaps, excuse them for endeavouring to take an interest not only in the present government, but in the future government of India, and to bear in mind our responsibilities to so many millions of people. He thought the suggestion in the Amendment was a good one. Personally he would like to see a majority of independent and non-official men on the Council. Most of those hon. Members who had had anything to do with official men knew that they were always biassed and that they could not take an independent and straightforward view of anything except an increase of their salaries or the securing of a longer holiday. That was not the case with business men. In business affairs the business man was accustomed to take a fair and intelligent view of human affairs. Such men were much more likely to do what was right and fair towards the people of India than were official men. He was sorry therefore that his right hon. friend could not see his way to accept the Amendment. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman was not refusing it on the ground that it was not an Amendment which came from himself or his official advisers. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman had resisted the Amendment, but he was glad to see that he took a much fairer and a more enlightened view of the Government of India in the future than his predecessors had done in the past.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and agreed to.

Mr. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.) moved to insert: "That of the members of the Council two shall be natives of India and two others of not less than ten years' residence in India who have not been in the service of the Government."

He desired to see his proposal embodied in the Bill because the right hon. Gentleman had already announced that it was his pleasure to nominate to the Indian Council two Indian gentlemen. He wished to see that provsion put in the Bill, because it was just possible that when the term of seven years' service of those gentlemen came to an end there might have been a change of Government and someone might be occupying the position of Secretary of State for India who had not such advanced views as his right hon. friend. He would like to make sure therefore, as regarded the policy of giving the natives of India a place on the Council that there would be no retrograde step taken in after years. With regard to the other part of his suggestion, that there should be on the Council two gentlemen of not less than ten years' residence in India, who had not been in the service of the Government, that, he might point out, only conformed to the present practice. For a good many years past there had been at least one member of the Council of this description and recently there had been two. In adopting this part of the Amendment, therefore, his right hon. friend would only be conforming to the present conditions, and as it was a very moderate proposition he trusted that the Secretary of State would see no objection to accepting it.

MR. MORLEY said he was not at all sorry that his hon. friend had referred to his intention as Secretary of State for India, an intention which he had already announced to Parliament, to appoint two Indian gentlemen to be members of the Council of India. That was a very important object, and, if an apology were needed, he thought that this matter alone was so essential that it justified him in keeping the House sitting at that untimely hour in order to get the Bill through. At the same time, he was afraid that he could not accept the Amendment, and he would briefly explain why. The Amendment proposed to do the very thing that all wise statesmanship forbade them to do, namely, to set up racial standards. There ought to be no statutory recognition of the differences between European and Indian members of that Council. If

he accepted his hon. friend's Amendment it would be putting into a Statute a recognition of fundamental differences of race, whereas all our civilising processes depended upon softening those differences so far as they could do. On that ground he was unwilling to recognise in a Statute such a word as "racial." Though he could not accept the Amendment he hoped the House would expedite the discussion of the Bill, remembering that it was not the mere small details that they were discussing. They were discussing the policy of admitting native gentlemen to the Council of India, and anybody who reflected on what a change that marked would agree that they ought not to cavil over small differences of opinion, but to keep well in view the great object of policy to which he had referred.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL moved to add the words, "Provided that any native of India appointed to such Council shall have been an elected member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council or of one of the provincial legislative councils at some-time during the five years preceding his appointment." He said that he regarded this as the most important of his Amendments to the Bill, and he again had to express his regret that the discussion had been started without hon. Members having any knowledge of what was coming before them. The Secretary of State desired to have two natives of India on the Council, and the object of the Amendment was to ensure that they should be men of authority. It was of the highest importance in the interests of India as a whole that these native members of the Council should be men who were looked up to in India, and he therefore proposed that they should be men who had already been selected by their fellow countrymen as fit persons to represent them on a legislative assembly. He was quite sure that such a thing was impossible under the administration of the present Secretary of State for India, but there was the utmost danger that at some time or another these native gentlemen might be selected not for their intellectual distinction but because of the certainty that they would always do exactly what they were told. That state of things existed to a surprising extent at one time in India. Hon. Members who had lived in India knew that there was not a legislative assembly or even a municipal council on which there were not numbers of native gentlemen who always said in regard to every matter, "As your honour wishes." In course of time it came to be regarded as an intolerable state of things that the people of India should be represented by men who never gave an opinion of their own, but who always voted with the official chairman. Therefore a system of election was introduced and most members of the district boards were now elected. Things had gone even further than that, however, because on the Legislative Councils also a certain number of native members were elected and a better class of men were in that way secured. These gentlemen were selected practically by vote, and his desire was to secure that persons of that type should come to assist the Secretary of State. There was no shadow of doubt that the time would come when men would be appointed not on account of their independence but on the certainty that they would support the Government of India. For that reason he desired to pass the Amendment.

MR. MORLEY resisted the Amendment. His objection could be stated, he said, in a single sentence. The Amendment restricted the area of choice of the Secretary of State. That must surely be a piece of mischief. The wider the area the more likely was the Secretary to be surrounded by competent men. If they wanted independence, knowledge and experience it was a mistake to put a check on the Secretary's choice.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY, Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) asked leave of the House to appeal to his hon. friends who were taking part in that debate. He was extremely sorry it should have happened that that Bill was brought on at such a time, but as possibly the House was aware the Government had private business next day, and also next week, and it was absolutely essential that the Bill should be brought on after eleven o'clock at night, and after private business. The private business that night, unfortunately, had taken some time, but that was not the fault of the Government. The India Bill had been put down first in the list. His point was that if they wished to finish their work in three weeks, or rather fifteen Parliamentary days, they must try to make some progress. If hon. Members would look at the state of the Order Paper, they would see there were some sixty stages of Bills, and they must take four or five each day to get through. The Government were doing the best they could to get the Bills on the Order Paper through, and there were one or two others desired practically by all parts of the House which would have to be starred. If the Government were not able to make progress they would have to abandon some of the Bills which were really so necessary.

*MR. C. J. O'DONNELL said in consequence of that appeal, because of his great regard for the Secretary for India, and as he was desirous to meet the Government as far as possible, he did not intend to proceed with any of the other Amendments in his name, but he hoped the House would forgive him in making the most absolute protest against that way of dealing with a Bill which concerned a population of 300,000,000. The interests of that population were of the most varied kind, and there was no more sacred duty resting on that House than to see that the Government of India as a good and satisfactory one. With these few words he begged leave to withdraw his Amendments.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

MR. MOONEY (Newry) moved to leave out the word 'five,' and to insert the word 'twelve.'" On the previous night he asked when the Bill was under discussion one or two questions of the Secretary of State, who did not give him a reply, probably owing to the fact that he had exhausted his right under the rules of the House. The question he wished to put was this.

Clause 2 provided that no person should be appointed to the Council of India who had been out of India for a longer period than five years. The case he desired to raise was the case of a person who was temporarily lent from the Council of India. When the famous Wyndham—MacDonnell correspondence was published it was distinctly stated by Sir Antony MacDonnell that he had been offered and had accepted a seat on the India Council, and that if he were to go to Ireland some arrangement would have to be made whereby he could retain his position on the India Council and go back to it when he had fulfilled the temporary position he was going to take in Ireland. The question he asked was whether Sir Antony MacDonnell was a member of the India Council.

MR. MORLEY: No.

MR. MOONEY: If not, when did he cease to be a member of the Council?

MR. MORLEY said it was a very intricate question. There was a doubt whether Sir Antony MacDonnell ever technically resigned. What was certain was that he never took his seat on the Council, that he never drew any emoluments as a member of the Council, and that at that moment he certainly was not a member of the Council. It was equally true that if that Bill passed Sir Antony MacDonnell could not be a member of the Council.

MR. MOONEY said he understood a promise was made to Sir Antony MacDonnell by the Government of the day in 1902. It was understood he was temporarily lent to the Government of Ireland.

MR. MORLEY: May I remind my hon. friend that I am not in any way responsible for, or even cognisant of, bargains made, perfectly legitimate bargains no doubt, between the Government of the day and Sir Antony MacDonnell.

MR. MOONEY said he always understood that a pledge publicly given by a Minister of the Crown to a member of the Civil Service of the Empire should be carried out by his successors in office unless there were very strong reasons, and these reasons should be stated, why the pledge should be broken. The Government of the day in this case through a responsible Minister promised that a certain thing would be done and he was rather astonished to learn that that promise was not binding on the successor of the Minister. In 1902 Sir Antony MacDonnell wrote to Mr. Wyndham:—

> "I told you I had been offered and had accepted nomination to a seat on the India Council and that it would be necessary for me to consult Lord George Hamilton before anything was settled regarding the Irish appointment. I have now seen Lord George Hamilton and I understand from him that there would probably be no difficulty in allowing me to retain a lien on the India Council and lending my services to the Irish Government."

Mr. Wyndham's answer was as follows:—

> "I ciphered the purport of your letter to the Prime Minister and received his concurrence by telegram yesterday and by letter this morning. It is understood you accept a seat on the India Council and are to be transferred when the vacancy occurs. I will ask Lord George Hamilton to see that the Press understands and insists on your great administrative achievements in India."

That was the undertaking given on the authority of the Prime Minister of the day that Sir Antony was to get a seat on the India Council—then to be lent to the Irish. As he understood the right hon. Gentleman now he seemed to have some doubt as to whether Sir Antony MacDonnell did become a member of the Council or had ever resigned. He had in his hand a publication issued by the right hon. Gentleman——

*SIR JOHN JARDINE: Is this discussion in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: We have nothing to do with the question whether Sir Antony MacDonnell is a member of the India Council, but the Amendment is to extend five years to twelve, and that allows the hon. Member to put his point.

MR. MOONEY submitted he was perfectly in order. He wanted to show that Sir Antony MacDonnell was not at the present moment acting on the India Council and that he would be debarred from going back, which would upset a promise and an undertaking given to a Civil Servant of the Crown in that House. He found in the India Office list that Sir Antony MacDonnell was described as having been a member of the Council, being appointed on 17th January, 1903. Then came this curious note, " Resigned January, 1905. Did not act, having held appointment of Under-Secretary for Ireland concurrently." What he wanted to know was, did Sir Antony resign by a written document, because otherwise he did not see how this could be ?

THE CHAIRMAN : I really do not think we have to deal with the question whether Sir Antony MacDonnell resigned by written document. All we are concerned with is whether the period in the clause is to be extended so that he could in future be appointed.

MR. MOONEY said the India List said that Sir Antony MacDonnell resigned in January, 1905. If he resigned then, did he resign in such a manner that, in the event of his expressing a desire to go back to the India Council, he could be appointed by the Secretary of State in the ordinary way ; and if that was so, would he not in the course of a year or two under the section they were discussing be debarred from doing that which it was distinctly understood he would be entitled to do when he went to Ireland.

MR. MORLEY said a member of the India Council who resigned could not be reappointed. If any gentleman had resigned he could not be reappointed. As to the Amendment before the House he must object to it.

MR. MOONEY asked if he was to understand that the entry in the India Office List was correct and that Sir Antony MacDonnell handed in his resignation.

MR. MORLEY said he could not say whether the list was correct or not. All those transactions took place before he took office. He had always understood there was no effective appointment, and that there could therefore be no technical resignation. As a matter of fact it was quite clear that Sir Antony MacDonnell never took his seat on the council and never received the emoluments.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR J. JARDINE said he wished to move an Amendment which dealt with a question of law and policy. As he understood it, references in the Bill to the Government of India Act. 1858, left unchanged the qualification of future nominees to the council to people who had served and resided in India, but the word India was defined in the Act of 1858 as being what they now called British India. The words used in that Amendment were taken from a later Act of Parliament, the Interpretation Act of 1889, and would enable the Secretary of State if he so chose to appoint persons who had resided in the territories of the native princes of India. His Amendment was—

" In page 1, line 10, at the end to insert the words: "and the word India shall, as regards any appointment made after the passing of this Act, mean British India together with the territories of any native prince or chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty exercised through the Governor-General of India or through any Governor or other officer subordinate to the Governor-General of India."

Our policy had been to extend privileges to persons under those native chiefs or princes, and the Amendment he had moved would help that policy to be carried out. It would also help the Secretary of State to choose not only native Judges of the High Courts or other experienced natives whose time had been spent in British India, but also Ministers of the native States, some of which were governed with great ability. Some of these men had done great service to the British Government in times of peril ; most of them had full acquaintance with native ways, and it would be well to include them in the definition.

MR. MORLEY said he did not think he could accept the Amendment. It was not really necessary, and it did not really greatly extend the area from which the Secretary of State could choose. He could not accept it.

*SIR J. JARDINE : The Amendment will include 70,000,000 people.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported, without Amendment; read the third time and passed.

WHALE FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) EXPENSES.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of expenses incurred by the Fishery Board for Scotland in pursuance of any Act of the present session to regulate Whale Fisheries in Scotland."

*MR. MORTON asked the Secretary for Scotland what the expenses amounted to, and what they were for. He did not want to detain the House, but he thought that he had a right to ask the question, and to get that information.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he thought they were entitled to have an answer to the question. If the Minister who was in charge of a measure was not able to be present, the measure should not be taken. Unless somebody replied to the question that had been put, he would feel bound to move that the Committee should report progress.

MR. WHITELEY said he hoped the noble Lord would not press his Motion. The business would be purely formal, and there would be other stages of the Bill when it could be discussed.

*MR. MORTON asked leave to say in answer to his hon. friend that the very object of taking the Committee stage on financial proposals was that they should have an opportunity of receiving an explanation as to what the money was wanted for, and what the amount was. If that was not so there would be no need for the Committee stage at all. He hoped his hon. friend would not try to lead the House to do anything which would injure its full control over the finances of the country.

MR. RAWLINSON said the matter was surely one of great importance. The question of finance was one which the House of Commons kept in its own hands. In a case of that kind where they had a financial Resolution taken separately from the Bill, if the Secretary of State could not be there they ought to have somebody present to give them an explanation. If the Government was unable properly to arrange the business of the country, and wanted to rush matters, that was no reason why they who were prepared to sit up should be persuaded by the hon. Member in charge of business to let a Bill pass through without discussion. The hon. Member told them that if they did not do that they would be unable to get through the remaining stages of the Bill in the next fortnight. They ought not as a business assembly to be expected to get through so many stages of the Bill, and that was no excuse for them as a business assembly in skirking their duty though it happened to be late at night. They ought not to allow important matters to go through the House in the way in which they had been doing that night. They were being told continually that the work of that House was being checked in another place, and they were told that the wishes of the people were not being properly regarded; but if they turned their business out badly they had no proper argument against the other House. He protested against the manner in which business was being conducted, and asked the House to see that the work was properly done even if it involved sitting up late.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden) said that as an individual connected with the Treasury he might, perhaps, be allowed to say a few words. It had been arranged between the two sides of the House that that stage should be taken that night practically without discussion. Opportunities for discussing the Bill would arise on other stages. The Bill was one in connection with the expenses in regard to whale fisheries, and it was necessary that that formal stage should be taken in order that the Bill might be proceeded with and discussed. The expense, he believed, would not be considerable. Apparently under Clause 4 of the Bill some expense would be necessary in order to provide for the inspection of factories or stations where persons were employed by the holders of licences.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's) said the hon. Gentleman had stated that an arrangement had been made to take certain things that night. His understanding of the arrangement was that certain business should not be proceeded with. When it was arranged that certain business should not be taken that could not be held to mean that the business which was taken should not be properly explained. They were entitled to an explanation. They were perfectly prepared to sit up and see that the business of the country was properly done. They were also prepared to sit later in the session, and no threats that if they could not get through the business by a certain date they would have to sit later, would avail with them.

MR. WHITELEY said he never made any threat.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he understood the threat had been used that a certain number of stages had to be carried before the end of the session, and that if they did not dispose of the business that night, they would have to take it up later in the session. So far as he and his friends were concerned, they were prepared to discuss the measures properly, whether they took a longer or shorter number of days. All they wanted was that if certain Bills had to be taken, and they had to sit up for them, the Minister in charge of the Bill, or some Minister who understood the Bill, should be there to give them some explanation That was not an unreasonable thing to expect.

*MR. MORTON said that he did not propose to go further in the discussion of this matter now that a junior Lord of the Treasury had endeavoured to give the Committee some explanation. He used the word "endeavoured" advisedly, because it was perfectly evident that the hon. Gentleman did not know very much about the subject on which he tried to enlighten them. What he wished to say was that if a number of Members of the House of Commons were willing to stay there at that time of the night and to help the Government to get its business through surely a paid Member of the Government ought to find no difficulty in staying. He protested against the statement of the Junior Lord of the Treasury not only that a bargain had been made between the two front Benches, but that it had been agreed that the Bill should be taken without discussion. That was a scandalous thing and it ought not to be tolerated for a moment in a Free Parliament.

LORD R. CECIL moved to report progress. He had listened to the explanation which the Junior Lord of the Treasury gave the Committee without enlightenment. The hon. Gentleman simply looked through the Bill till he found the portion printed in italics and then he said, "Those are the expenses which are required." That was the best the hon. Gentleman could do. There were three Gentlemen representing Scotland who had places on the Treasury Bench—the Secretary for Scotland, the Lord Advocate, and the Solicitor-General for Scotland. These Gentlemen were bound owing to their official duties to know what was in the Bill and as a matter of fact, the names of two of them were on the back of the Bill. He thought that one of the trio ought out of courtesy to the Committee to have been there in order to explain to the Committee any points which might be raised. From a business point of view also the attendance of one of these representatives of Scotland was neeessary. They were bound to take cognisance of the absence of these Ministers, and the only way in which they could do so was by reporting progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 13; Noes, 100. (Division List No. 383.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Hunt, Rowland
Salter, Arthur Clavell

Sloan, Thomas Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Ayes—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Rawlinson.

NOES.

Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bowerman, C. W.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Clough, William
Collins Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Horniman, Emslie John

Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Rainy, A. Rolland

Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scott, A. H. (Aston under Lyne)
Shackleton, David James
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Main question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow (Wednesday.)

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [Lords.]

Considered in Committee, and reported; read the third time and passed, without Amendment.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP BILL [Lords.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) said he was loth to trouble the House with any lengthy remarks at that hour of the night. He would not have ventured to move the Second Reading of the Bill at that stage of the session had it not been within the knowledge of many hon. Members that this question had been before the public for the last twelve or fifteen years, and that attempts to deal with it had been made by successive Governments. Hon. Members were fully aware of the subject with which they proposed to deal, and for that reason he felt it to be unnecessary that he should enter into any lengthy explanation. Undoubtedly, however, the main question with which the Bill dealt was one of very considerable difficulty for reasons known to all hon. Members. His right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer endeavoured to deal with it in the Factory Bill of 1895. In 1900, Sir Matthew White Ridley endeavoured to treat the subject in a different manner, and give the Secretary of State power to apply the provisions of the Factory Act to laundries by Order. In 1901 Mr.

Ritchie put a clause into the Factory and Workshop Bill of that year dealing with the question, but not in any way in the full manner proposed in the present Bill. At any rate Mr. Ritchie made a more or less gallant attempt to deal with the matter in that Bill, but owing to dissensions on certain points he decided to drop the clause. His right hon. friend opposite in 1905, announced that the last Government were still favourable to the proposals of the Bill of 1901. Every Government since 1892 had had the same view that that question ought to be dealt with and had made more or less strenuous efforts to deal with it. As hon. Members were aware, there were great numbers of laundries which were altogether outside the operations of the present Act—institution laundries, domestic laundries, laundries not carried on for gain, laundries connected with hospitals, and so forth. With regard to those that were under the Act, the present law was in a most unsatisfactory state. Provided the maximum of fourteen hours per day and sixty hours per week was not exceeded in the case of adults any employer could by merely putting up a notice early in the morning change his weekly hours as he pleased. The result was the factory inspector could not know when to visit in order to check the hours of work, and inspection was consequently largely evaded. In addition to that the laundries were exempt at present from the provisions with regard to certificates, and the regulations as to dangerous trades—fencing of machinery and so forth. Therefore, as he said, the law was in a most unsatisfactory condition. The Government proposed to bring under the law all laundries where persons were employed for wages or which were carried on for the purpose of trade or gain, and, in the second place, they proposed to subject to the provisions of the Act all industries, including laundries, which were attached to institutions, reformatory or charitable, which were not already under Government inspection. There were other provisions, such as the proposal to make available the services of factory inspectors for those institutions which were already under public inspection—prisons, workhouses, reformatories or industrial schools—and which might desire to have the services of a specially trained factory inspector. He had alluded to the difficulties which had hitherto stood in the way of the question being dealt with. There were trade interests to consider and the usual trade opposition. There were also religious susceptibilities which had proved, perhaps, the most formidable of all the difficulties which had to be met. There was a third reason, and that was that there was no solid active movement pushing on legislation on the subject. It was not altogether creditable either to the country or to the House of Commons that this was so. Excepting certain individuals who took a great interest in these matters there did not seem to be any definite public opinion or movement such as a Minister could generally rely upon to overcome the special difficulties which might interfere with the settlement of a question. So far as he was concerned, from the moment he introduced the Bill he had received hardly any representations on the subject. Nobody seemed particularly interested in the Bill, in the public or in the Press. At the same time he would point out to the House that the non-settlement of the matter was nothing less than a public scandal. They had many thousands of laundries in the country employing a great army of workwomen, something like 200,000 strong, under the most unsatisfactory conditions. He did not pretend to say the Bill was in every way perfect, but the Government were ready to consider any points in regard to which improvement could be made so long as the safety of the Bill was not endangered. He maintained that the Bill, as it was, was worth having. In the first place it enabled them to apply to laundries generally stricter supervision and a better system of hours. Although they might be leaving something still to be done yet, if once the first obstacle were overcome they could bring in subsequently remedies or improvements which might be found necessary. The first thing was to overcome the initial difficulty of legislation, and that was why he asked the House to give the Bill a Second Reading. There had been strong opposition from some quarters to that Bill, but he would tell the House frankly that the Government had met the objections raised in these quarters. In order to meet the objections to which he referred they had agreed that, as regarded reformatory institutions where it was desired, private interrogations by inspectors of inmates should be excluded except on the authority of the Secretary of State. If it was objected that that might hamper the operation of the Act, his answer was that that might be so. It might be, perhaps, that in making that arrangement the Government had fallen short of a perfect system of inspection, and were introducing a certain anomaly. But it was a choice between that and not getting the Bill, and if they did not get the Bill that session, he must frankly say to hon. Members that he saw very little chance of getting any Bill dealing with the subject, through that House during the present Parliament. They were making a small concession in regard to something less than 230 institutions all told. The main object of the Bill was to deal with the thousands of commercial laundries throughout the country. He urged hon. Members who thought that the concession the Government were proposing was against the spirit of legislation to remember that it was the only chance by which they could pass the Bill that session, and that otherwise they would have to wait many years before it was put on the Statute-book. The Bill would effect a great improvement on the existing law. It was badly wanted throughout the country, and he asked the House to give it a Second Reading and send it to a Standing Committee which would consider any points which would not prove fatal to it this session.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said he would not at that hour detain the House. The right hon. Gentleman had explained the purpose of the Bill. It was to amend the Factory and Workshops Act in respect of laundries, and to extend the Act to certain religious and charitable institutions where laundry work was done which at present escaped inspection. He entirely agreed as to the desirability of amending the law. There might be some hon. Gentlemen in the House who might think the Government ought to have gone farther in this matter, but the right hon. Gentleman pointed out the great difficulties which lay in his path. He pointed out how these difficulties had prevented his predecessors dealing as fully with the matter as they would have wished. At the present moment the Factories and Workshops Act only applied to laundries which were carried on by way of trade and for the purposes of gain. Domestic laundries attached to religious and charitable institutions were expressly excluded from the operations of the Act. In these institutions neither the law as to hours of labour nor the law as to sanitation applied. The Bill, at any rate, carried the law a very great deal farther than at present, and would, he thought, be a very great boon to those employed in laundries. When some years ago he (Mr. Akers-Douglas) occupied the position the right hon. Gentleman now occupied he gave some instructions that a measure should be drafted for the purpose of the Bill before he left office. He therefore entirely agreed in the necessity to deal with the question. He had tried when he found that his predecessor had been unable, owing to that great difficulty of getting over a certain opposition in that House, to deal with the question as fully as the Home Office wished, a system of voluntary inspection, and a large number of charitable institutions, about half the total, were regularly inspected at their own wish by the factory inspectors. But he was certain that anybody who had read last year's Factories Report must have been persuaded that voluntary inspection was not at all satisfactory. He found when he was at the Home Office that the various institutions connected in England with the Church of England were not only ready to be inspected but welcomed inspection, and that a large number of Roman Catholic institutions in this country were also anxious to have such inspection. He did not find that the same welcome was given to inspection in Ireland. However that might be, the Report to which he had alluded made it perfectly clear that nowhere was a measure of that kind more needed than in Ireland. He would be anxious to see when they came to the Committee stage what words the right hon. Gentleman would insert to satisfy hon. Gentlemen from Ireland. All he wanted to see was that factories and laundries were properly inspected without putting religious institutions to any great trouble. He recognised that it was impossible to have the same powers of inspection in those institutions as in ordinary factories, but he trusted that the inspection to be given would be as thorough as the circumstances merited. He was quite certain that the measure which the right hon. Gentleman had introduced was far better than anything which they had hitherto had, and it was likely to receive the sanction of all Members of the House. For that reason he welcomed it, though there might be some points which he would have to criticise, when they came to the Committee stage.

MR. GILL (Bolton) said he had no intention of opposing the Second Reading of the Bill, but he wished to state that there were one or two matters in Clause 2 which ought to be improved. He quite agreed with the Home Secretary that it was absolutely necessary that they should have an improvement in the inspection of factories and laundries, but he objected entirely to women and girls being called on to work five days a week from nine o'clock in the morning till nine o'clock in the evening, as was provided for in the Bill. He thought that it was unnecessary for any woman or girl to be called on to work till nine o'clock at night. Some of the women were married and could not look after their families if they were working till that time. With regard to overtime, which was provided for by allowing them to work from six o'clock in the morning till seven o'clock at night on certain days in the week, he thought that ought to be prohibited if it was possible to do so. The law ought to be worked as it was in the textile factories. The worst clause was one in regard to holidays. That clause provided that on any other day in the week but Saturday a half-holiday could be taken in the forenoon. There was no single industry where such a practice was followed. Everybody knew that where a half-holiday was taken it should be taken after twelve o'clock. He gave notice that at a future stage he would move Amendments dealing with that question and with the question of long hours.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) said the question was one which had excited the interest of his co-religionists in this country. He had attended a deputation which waited on the Home Secretary in reference to the measure, and that deputation was made up not only of his co-religionists but also of members of Church of England. In fact the majority consisted not only of his co-religionists but of members of the Church of England, and Jews and Wesleyans were also represented. He would like to speak of the extreme courtesy with which they were received by the right hon. Gentleman. He was strongly in favour of the measure, and would certainly support the Second Reading. The reason why the feelings of many of his co-religionists towards the measure were changed was, he believed, because his right hon. friend behind him when he was Home Secretary had started a system of voluntary inspection. It was natural that religious institutions should be frightened at the idea of inspection, but a system of voluntary inspection had familiarised them with the principles of it, and they had found it to be of great assistance in enabling them to appreciate and learn to use up-to-date machinery, while it had also taught them some things in regard to sanitation. The measure, in the form in which he understood that it was being brought in, would have his support.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said the Bill was one which had been long promised to the House. It was promised early in the year that it would be presented before Easter, but as a matter of fact it now came before the House at a time of the session and an hour of the night when the right hon. Gentleman knew that it would be impossible to discuss it in full detail. He must say, notwithstanding the right hon. Gentleman's assurances that the Bill was worth having, that he believed that on the whole it was a denial of all their hopes. So far as he had read it, the Bill was scarcely worth the paper it was printed on. Clause 5, Section 2, would, he thought, if hon. Members took the trouble to study the Bill, exempt, in the most insidious way, all religious institutions from inspection of any kind whatever. He would remind the House that for every one of those institutions fifty years ago there were twenty now, and they were competing most unfairly with other laundries, in wages and hours of labour, and free from all control whatever. He thought that on further consideration of the Bill hon. Members would come to the conclusion that it was a very serious matter that those laundries should go on, without any regulations as to hours of labour, and without any inspection whatever as to sanitary conditions, in competing with other laundries. He only made that short protest, for he did not want to keep the House sitting at that late hour of the night. It was not their fault, but the fault of the Government and of the right hon. Gentleman, that that should be so, for they had promised to introduce the Bill before Easter.

*MR. GLADSTONE said the Bill was introduced in the House of Lords.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said that had been an evasion of the promise to bring in the Bill early. To bring in the Bill late in August, and to suppose that any full discussion could then be taken, was placing an almost hopeless problem before the House. He believed the wording of Section 2 of Clause 5 really evaded the promise given by the Government that there would be a thorough inspection of every laundry, whether it belonged to a religious institution or not. He believed that it was owing to the insidious wording of that clause that they had the silent acquiesence of hon. Members below the gangway in the Bill being read a second time. They would never have agreed to that if the inspection had been really meant to be as thorough in the case of those laundries as in the case of all other laundries. Having made that protest, he would allow the Bill to proceed.

MR. A. C. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said the Home Secretary had alluded to the Bill as not having a great amount of enthusiasm behind it. He never remembered any introducer of a Bill making such a remark before. The reason for that want of enthusiasm was not far to seek. Not long ago he introduced a Bill on that subject and there was great enthusiasm for that Bill. The enthusiasm was conspicuous and marked throughout the working classes in the country. The reason for the enthusiasm for that Bill was that it was thorough in its character and that it really did bring all laundries under proper inspection. If the Home Secretary had had the courage to get rid once and for all of that serious omission in his Bill he would find no want of enthusiasm for it among the working classes of the country.

Question put, and agreed to. Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 26th day of July last, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at one minute before Three o'clock a.m.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLXXIX.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) House of Lords.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Australian States Constitution	*Earl of Elgin*	Royal Assent 2nd August (1373)
*Butter and Margarine	*Earl Carrington*	Read 1^a 29th July (384) Read 2^a 1st August (1177)
Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock)	*Lord Avebury*	Committee 30th July (702) Report 31st July (931) Read 3^a and passed 1st August (1183)
*Criminal Appeal	*Lord Loreburn*	Read 1^a 30th July (702) Read 2^a 5th August (1471)
*Evicted Tenants (Ireland)	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 1^a 2nd August (1374) Read 2^a 6th August (1696)
*Evidence (Colonial Statutes)	*Earl of Elgin*	Read 1^a 1st August (1157)
Fatal Accidents (Damages)	*Lord Courtney of Penwith*	Read 1^a 30th July (737) Read 2^a 6th August (1690)
*Finance	*Marquess of Ripon*	Read 1^a 31st July (932)
*Imported Watch Cases	*Earl of Granard*	Read 3^a and passed 25th August (12) Royal Assent 2nd August (1373)
Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment	*Lord Aberdare*	Royal Assent 26th July (237)
*Lights on Vehicles	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 2^a 25th July (4) Committee 30th July (705)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Married Women's Property	*Lord Loreburn*	Read 2^a 25th July (10) Committee 5th August (1484) Report 6th August (1805)
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment	*Lord Ampthill*	Committee 29th July (393) Report 6th August (1690)
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) (Deduction for Propelling Power)	*Earl of Granard*	Read 1^a 2nd August (1374)
Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland)	*Earl of Mayo*	Read 2^a 31st July (926) Committee Report } 1st August (1183) Read 3^a and passed 5th August (1488)
*Post Office Sites	*Earl of Granard*	Read 2^a 30th July (715) Read 1^a 6th August (1690)
*Prisons (Ireland)	*Lord Denman*	
*Probation of Offenders (No. 2)	*Earl Beauchamp*	Read 1^a 29th July (385) Read 2^a 5th August (1486)
*Public Health	*Lord Allendale*	Read 1^a 31st July (932)
Public Health (Scotland) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell*	Read 2^a 31st July (928) Committee Report } 1st August (1183)
*Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) Scotland [H.L.]	*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell*	Read 3^a and passed 25th July (12)
*Released Persons (Poor Law Relief)	*Earl Beauchamp*	Read 1^a 29th July (385) Read 2^a 2nd August (1487)
*Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties)	*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell*	Read 1^a 6th August (1690)
*Telegraph (Money)	*Earl of Granard*	Read 1^a 29th July (384) Read 2^a 30th July (714) Read 3^a and passed 31st July (931) Royal Assent 2nd August (1373)
*Territorial and Reserve Forces	*Earl of Portsmouth*	Royal Assent 2nd August (1373)
Vaccination	*Lord Allendale*	Read 1^a 29th July (385) Read 2^a 1st August (1181)
Vaccination (Scotland)	*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell*	Read 2^a 1st August (1157)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Australian States Constitution	*Mr. Churchill*	Committee } 31st Report } July Read 3° and passed } (1129) Royal Assent 2nd August (1374)
*British North America	*Mr. Churchill*	Consideration of Lords' Amendments 2nd August (1456)
*Butter and Margarine	*Sir E. Strachey*	Report 26th July (295)
*Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) [H.L.]	*Sir W. Holland*	Read 1° 5th August (1563)
*Coal Mines (Eight Hours)	*Mr. Gladstone*	Read 1° 1st August (1233)
*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)	*Mr. Asquith*	Read 1° 1st August (1345)
*Council of India	*Mr. Morley*	Read 1° 25th July (159) Read 2° 5th August (1673) Committee 6th August (1968)
*Criminal Appeal	*Sir J. Walton*	Report } 29th July Read 3° and passed } (587)
*Education (Administrative Provisional)	*Mr. McKenna*	Read 2° 31st July (1097)
*Education (Special Religious Instruction)	*Mr. McKenna*	Read 2° 29th July (695)
*Employment of Women [H.L.]	*Mr. H. Samuel*	Read 2° 2nd August (1465)
*Evicted Tenants (Ireland)	*Mr. Birrell*	Report 29th July (501) Read 3° and passed 2nd August (1355)
*Evidence (Colonial Statutes)	*Mr. Churchill*	Report } 31st July Read 3° and passed } (1126)
*Factory and Workshop [H.L.]	*Mr. Gladstone*	Read 2° 6th August (1991)
*Finance	*Mr. Asquith*	Read 3° and passed 30th July (786)
*Imported Watch Cases	*Mr. Kearley*	Royal Assent 2nd August (1374)
*Irish Council	*Mr. Birrell*	Bill withdrawn 29th July (693)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Local Registration of Titles (Ireland)	*Mr. Cherry*	Bill withdrawn 29th July (695)
*Lunacy (Ireland)	*Mr. Cherry*	Bill withdrawn 29th July (695)
*Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment [H.L.]	*Sir J. Walton*	Read 2° 26th July (376) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 1st Aug. (1372)
*Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) (Deduction for Propelling Power)	*Mr. Lloyd-George*	Committee 1st August (1345) Report Read 3° and passed } 2nd Aug. (1456)
Motor Cars (Collisions and Accidents)	*Mr. Bertram*	Read 1° 6th August (1849)
*Municipal Milk Depots	*Mr. J. Burns*	Bill withdrawn 26th July (376)
*Naval Lands (Volunteers)	*Mr. E. Robertson*	Bill withdrawn 29th July (695)
*Patents and Designs (Consolidation)	*Mr. Lloyd-George*	Read 2° 26th July (376)
*Poisons and Pharmacy	*Mr. H. Samuel*	Bill withdrawn 26th July (376)
*Prisons (Ireland)	*Mr. Cherry*	Read 2° 2nd August (1457) Committee Report Read 3° and passed } 5th August (1687)
*Prize Courts [H.L.]	*Sir J. Walton*	Read 1° 6th August (1849)
Probation of Offenders (No. 2)	*Mr. Gladstone*	Report Read 3° and passed } 26th July (370)
*Public Health (Regulations as to Food)	*Mr. J. Burns*	Read 2° 2nd August (1441)
*Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) [H.L.]	*Mr. Burns*	Read 1° 1st August (1233)
*Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils) (Scotland) [H.L.]	*Mr. Sinclair*	Read 1° 1st August (1233)
*Released Persons (Poor Law Relief)	*Mr. H. Samuel*	Read 3° and passed 26th July (376)
*Rule Committee [H.L.]	*Sir J. Walton*	Read 1° 6th August (1849)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries [H.L.]	*Sir E. Strachey*	Read 2° 30th July (920) Committee 2nd August (1467) Report } 5th August Read 3° and passed } (1688)
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Read 2° 2nd August (1457) Committee } 5th August Report } Read 3° and passed } (1688)
*Small Landholders (Scotland)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Report 6th August (1850)
*Statute Law Revision [H.L.]	*Sir J. Walton*	Bill withdrawn 26th July (376)
*Telegraph (Construction)	*Mr. S. Buxton*	Bill withdrawn 29th July (695)
*Telegraph (Money)	*Mr. S. Buxton*	Read 3° and passed 26th July (365) Royal Assent 2nd August (1374)
*Territorial and Reserve Forces	*Mr. Haldane*	Consideration of Lords' Amendments 30th July (889) Royal Assent 2nd August (1374)
*Vaccination	*Mr. J. Burns*	Read 3° and passed 26th July (376)
*Whale Fisheries (Scotland)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Read 2° 2nd August (1458)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1907.

List of Rules, Orders, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

In Continuation of List given in previous Volume.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Public Trustee Rules, 1907 [6 Edw. VII., c. 55, s. 14 (2)]	31 July	30 days
Supreme Court (Rules),—Copy of Rules of the Supreme Court, dated 3rd August, 1907 [39 and 40 Vic., c. 59, s. 17].	2 August	40 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

JULY 25—*AUGUST* 6.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abbeyleix
  Injury to Filly, Cause of and Claim for.
    Qs. Mr. Meehan, Mr Delany; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 967.

Aberdeen Corporation Electricity Bill
  c. *Con.*,* *July 30*, 738.
    3R.* *Aug. 2*, 1375.

Aberdeen Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
  c. 2R.* *July 25*, 106.
    Con.,* *July 29*, 438.
    3R.* *July* 30, 738.
  l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Aberdeen Harbour Order Confirmation Bill
  l. 1R., 2R., *Com.* and *Rep.*,* *Aug. 6*, 1689.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork Co., N.E.]
  Ballydoyle Estate, Purchase of, *Aug. 1*, 1202.
  Hyde Estate—Case of T. Bullman, *July 31*, 939.
  Imaal Camp Roads, Maintenance of, *Aug. 1*, 1229.
  Mitchelstown — Kingston College Trust, *Aug. 5*, 1552.
  Poor Law Inspectors, Number of, *Aug. 1*, 1224.

Acland, Mr. F. D. [Yorks, Richmond]
  Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill. 2R., *July 31*, 1109-1111.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A. [Somerset Wellington]
  Agriculture Department Vote—Facilities for Discussion, *July 25*, 201.
  Business of the House, Course of, *July 31*, 976.
  Cordite, Tests for, *July 31*, 1045.
  Irish Council Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 693.

Admiralty
  First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
  Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.
  Clothing Contracts, Allocation of.
    Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25*, 112.
  Foundry Work supplied by Ayrshire Foundry Company.
    Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug.* 6, 1817.
  French-polishers, Female, employed in Dockyards.
    Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 2*, 1381.
  Painting Work, Payment of Labourers for.
    Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 6*, 1809.
  Press Communications by Officials.
    Qs. Mr. Hay; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 29*, 462; *July 31*, 946, 947.
  Queenstown Deputation, Reply to.
    Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 1*, 1205, 1206.
  Vote for, *July 31*, 1083; Aug. 1, 1239.

Aerial Flight
Grant for Research.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1517.

Africa
Survey—Report (1906–7) presented, *Aug. 2*, 1376 ; *Aug. 5*, 1470.

Africa, Central
Admission of Protectorate to South African Customs Convention.
Os. Mr. Rees, *Aug. 1*, 1304.
Hut Tax, amount of.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 480.
Zomba, Troops at.
Q. Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 761.

Africa, East
[*See also names of Places*].
Hut Tax, amount of.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 480.

Africa, South
[*See also names of Colonies, etc.*]
Garrison
Accommodation erected for, since the War.
Q. Mr. Whitbread ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 746, 747.
Claims for Rebates of Customs Duties on Goods.
Q. Mr. Holt ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 6*, 1823, 1824.

Africa, West
[*See also names of Places*].
San Thomé and Principé, Labourers in.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 130.
Q. Mr. Byles ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 740, 741.

African Steamship Company
British Government Payment to.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon ; *A.* Captain Norton, *Aug. 6*, 1827, 1828.

Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906
Arbitration under.
Q. Mr. Morton ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 25*, 145.

Agricultural Organisation Society, Irish
Grant to—Controversy with Agriculture Department.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 164, 165 ; Mr. H. Law, 199 ; Mr. J. P. Nannetti, 201.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Annual Meeting—Report of Proceedings, Presented, *July 25*, 3, 108.
Statistics (1906)—Vol. XLI., Part III., Presented, *July 30*, 697, 740.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Vice-President—Rt. Hon. T. W. Russell.
Administrative Policy of.
Os. Mr. Clancy, *July 25*, 183–186 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 187 ; Mr. T. W. Russell, 192–196 ; Mr. Barrie, 197, 198
Agriculturists planted on Economic Holdings, Assistance to.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 168 ; Mr. Hayden, 172.
Committees, Audit Fees paid by.
Q. Mr. O'Shee ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1528.
Income and Expenditure of.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 166, 169.
Statement [Mr. T. W. Russell] *July 25*, 160–171.
Vice-President — Making a Non-Parliamentary Office, proposed.
Os. Mr. Butcher, *July 25*, 181 ; Mr. H. Law, 199.
Vote for, *July 25*, 159.
Discussion, Facilities for.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 25*, 201, 202 ; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 201.
Western Districts, Work in.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 166.
Working of—Departmental Committee of Inquiry, Reports and Recommendations.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 160-163 ; Mr. Hayden, 173 ; Mr. Butcher, 179–183.

Ailsa Craig
Rating Valuation.
Q. Mr. J. D. White ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 5*, 1545.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 684.

Airedale, Baron
Introduced to House of Lords, *Aug. 1*, 1137.

Airships
Explosives, use of, *see under* Explosives.

Aland Islands
Russian Occupation of.
Qs. Mr. Ashley ; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 765, 766.

All-British Steamship Route
See under Merchant Shipping.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Bermondsey—Discharges from Tanner St. Workhouse, *July 29*, 488.
Lagos—Timber Concession to Mr. Brown, *July 29*, 479.
Local Government Board — Position of Ridley Clerks, *Aug. 5*, 1519.
Trafalgar Square, Shrubs, etc., for, *Aug. 6*, 1809.

Aliens
  Deportations made.
    Q. Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 5*, 1518.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
  Blind Persons in County of London, *Aug. 1*, 1198.
  Blind Persons, Government Assistance to, *Aug. 6*, 1814.
  Disorderly Houses—Removal of Girls over Fourteen, *Aug. 5*, 1515.
  Juvenile Offenders—Detention while awaiting trial, *Aug. 1*, 1198.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucester, Stroud]
  Copper Coins, Scarcity of, *July 29*, 457.

Allendale Lord
  Dairy Industry, State Control of, Proposed, *July 25*, 14–16.
  Vaccination Bill, 2R., *Aug 1*, 1181-1183.

Alton Military Hospital Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Alverstone, Lord—*Lord Chief Justice*
  High Court of Justice, King's Bench Division—Appointment of Additional Judge, *July 29*, 388-392.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
  Hampstead Borough Council, Labourers discharged by, *Aug. 6*, 1814.

Ampthill, Lord
  Bills—Printing to show what parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 402.
  Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 393, 394.

Ancketill Grove
  Purchase and Disposal of.
    Q. Mr. Lardner; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 782, 783.

Annfield Plain and District Gas Bill
  l. 3R.,* *July 25*, 377.
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *Aug. 1*, 1184.
  l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
  Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 591, 622, 623, 643.
  Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1099–1104.
  Low Valley Roman Catholic School, *July 25*, 234, 235.
  Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *Aug. 5*, 1540–1542, 1641–1645.

Anstruther-Gray, Major [St. Andrews Burghs]
  Aerial flight—Grant for Research, *Aug 5*, 1517.
  Army
    Bayonet—Result of Trials, *Aug. 5*, 1531.
    Cavalry
      Barracks for Scotland, *Aug.* 5, 1530, 1531.
      Sword—Result of Trials, *Aug. 5*, 1531.
    Horses, Reserve of, *Aug. 5*, 1517.
    Scots Greys, Accommodation for, *July 30*, 754, 755.
  Ben Nevis Observatories, Grant for, *Aug. 1*, 1213.
  Grantown-on-Spey Telephone Service, *Aug. 1*, 1217.
  Hague Conference Proceedings, Tabling of, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
  Nigeria — Railway Construction in the North, *Aug. 5*, 1532.
  St. Helena — Flax Cultivation, *Aug. 1*, 1192.
  Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill, Date of Taking, *Aug. 5*, 1547.
  Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1462.

Antrim
  Labourers' Cottages Grant.
    Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1548.

Ardglass Harbour
  Churn Rock, Cost of Removing.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 5*, 1542, 1543.

Arkwright, Mr. J. S. [Hereford]
  Irish Council Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 694.

Armagh Urban District Council Bill
  l. 3R., *July 29*, 378; *Aug. 1*, 1138.

Army
    Secretary of State — Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
    Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
    Financial Secretary — Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
  Ammunition — Copper Pressure Gauges used in Testing.
    Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 751.
  Auxiliary Forces (*see* titles Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry).
  Barracks (*see also subheadings names* of Barracks).

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Bayonet—Result of Trials.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1531.

Bullet Velocities.
Qs. Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 751.

Cartridges—Breech Pressure and Muzzle Velocity.
Qs. Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 750, 752.

Cavalry

Barracks for Scotland.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1530, 1531.

Sword—Result of Trials.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1531.

Cordite Committee, *see* Explosives—Rayleigh Cordite Committee.

Disbanded Battalions, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Salter; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 473.

Dunlearey, J. M., Case of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 25*, 121, 122.

Horses, Reserve of.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1517.

Imaal Camp—Maintenance of Roads in Vicinity.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 1*, 1229.

Indian Army, *see under* India.

Lee-Enfield Rifles—Orders placed at Enfield.
Q. Mr. Branch; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 6*, 1810.

Medical College at Millbank—Contracts sub-let abroad.
Qs. Mr. Remnant; *As.* Mr. Haldane, Mr. Speaker, *July 29*, 470, 471.

Messing, Cost of.
Q. Colonel Long; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 448.

Plain Clothes Regulations, Extension of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Mallet; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 465.

Pontefract—Proposals for Transfer of Pay Department.
Q. Mr. Nussey; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1516.

Scots Greys, Accommodation for at Tidworth.
Qs. Viscount Turnour, Captain Faber, Mr. Ashley, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 753–755.

Second Line, *see subheading* Territorial Forces.

Shooting Team for the Colonies, Payments to.
Qs. Mr. Courthope; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 749, 750.

Army—*cont.*

Soldiers, Civil Employment of—Case of Sergeant working at North Wall Goods Store.
Qs. Mr. Hudson; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 25*, 126, 127.

Submarine Miners, Disposal of
Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 474..

Surveyors acting as Division Officers, Pay of.
Q. Mr. Ridsale; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 6*, 1818.

Territorial Force

Cavalry, Training and Armament of.
Qs. Sir S. Scott, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 463–465.

County Associations

Grants to, Audit of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 465.

Secretaryships.
Qs. Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 752, 753.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *see that title.*

Tidworth Barracks

Accommodation in.
Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 25*, 126.

Mooltan Block, Cost of, &c.
Qs. Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 752.

Windsor Victoria Barracks—Married Quarters.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 6*, 1819.

Woolwich Arsenal, *see that title.*

Army Estimates

Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiences

Resolution Mr. Runciman *July 29*, 696; *July 40*, 920–924; *Reported July 31*, 1132.

Appropriation Accounts—Referring to Committee
Resolution [Mr. Runciman] *July 29*, 696.

Civil Superannuation and Allowances—£173,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1085; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1240.

Educational Establishments—£137,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1085; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1240.

Half Pay, Retired Pay and other Non-Effective Charges—£1,714,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1085; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1240.

Medical Establishment—£460,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1084; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Militia—£840,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1084; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Miscellaneous Effective Services—£67,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1085; *Rep.* Aug 1*, 1240.

[*cont.*

Army Estimates—*cont.*
- Ordnance Department, etc.—£620,000, *Com.* July 31,* 1085; *Rep.* Aug. 1,* 1240.
- Ordnance Factories—£100, *Com.* July 31,* 1086; *Rep.* Aug. 1,* 1240.
- Pensions—£1,709,000, *Com.* July 31,* 1085; *Rep.* Aug. 1,* 1240.
- Quartering Transport and Remounts—£1,909,000, *Com.* July 31,* 1085; *Rep.* Aug. 1,* 1240.
- Volunteers—£1,152,000, *Com.* July 31,* 1084; *Rep.* Aug. 1,* 1239.
- War Office and Accounts Department—£567,000, *Com.* July 31,* 1085; *Rep.* Aug. 1,* 1240.
- Yeomanry—£410,600, *Com.* July 31,* 1084; *Rep.* Aug. 1,* 1239.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
- Militia Special Contingent Establishment, *Aug. 1,* 1203.
- Navy
  - Cordite—Cooling Apparatus for Storage Magazines, *July 31,* 1019.
  - Cruisers—Construction Programme, *July 31,* 1019.
  - Repairs, Policy as to, and Expenditure on, *July 31,* 1018, 1019.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5,* 1602–1606.

Arran, Earl of
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6,* 1753–1758.

Ashbourne, Lord
- Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5,* 1476–1479.
- Elementary Schools, Provision of—Allocation of Grant, Legal and Constitutional Aspect of the matter, *July 25,* 59.
- Evicted Tenants—Terms of Reinstatement on Ponsonby, Luggacurran and Coolgreany Estates, *July 30,* 732.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6,* 1702, 1767, 1794.
- Married Women's Property Bill, 2R., *July 25,* 11.
- Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 31,* 927; 3R., *Aug. 5,* 1488.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]
- Aland Islands, Russian Occupation of, *July 30,* 765, 766.
- Army—Scots Greys, Accommodation for, *July 30,* 754.
- Australian States Constitution Bill, *Com., July 31,* 1129.
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con., July 26,* 320, 329, 340.

Ashley, Mr. W. W.—*cont.*
- Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31,* 1121, 1122.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 29,* 529–533, 541, 547; 3R., *Aug. 2,* 1409, 1430.
- Greenwich Observatory—Negotiations as to Electric Generating Station, *Aug. 5,* 1530.
- Morocco
  - Terms demanded for Release of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 25,* 131.
  - Unrest in, *Aug. 5,* 1536, 1537.
- Norway and Sweden—Negotiations for Treaty, *July 30,* 766.
- Post Office Contributions to Ferry Upkeep, *July 30,* 775, 776.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Date of considering Lords' Amendments, *July 29,* 497.
- Thames Minefields and Guns, Information as to, *July 29,* 474.

Ashton, Mr. T. G. [Bedfordshire, Luton]
- Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30,* 814–816.
- National Debt, Reduction of, *July 30,* 814–816.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 2,* 1373.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fifeshire, E.]
- Ben Nevis Observatories, Grant for, *Aug. 1,* 1213.
- Business, State of—Failure to carry out Programme, etc., *July 26,* 259–261.
- Carnarvon—Estate Duties paid (1901–6), *July 31,* 944.
- Colonial Loans Guaranteed by Imperial Government, *July 29,* 443.
- Colonial Preference, Policy of, *July 30,* 822, 827.
- Consolidated Fund, Allowances paid out of, *July 30,* 770, 771.
- Consols
  - Decline in, *Aug. 6.* 1829.
  - Government purchases of, *Aug. 5,* 1522.
- Copper Coins, Scarcity of, *July 29,* 457.
- Exeter Income Tax Distraints—Case of Mr. H. Hems, *Aug 6,* 1831.
- Finance Accounts—Estimate of Contingent Liabilities, *Aug 6,* 1829.
- Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30,* 812, 819–823.
- Financial position of the Country, *July 30,* 820–822.
- Food, Taxation of, *July 30,* 819.

[*cont.*

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*

Income Tax

Abatements, delay in paying, *Aug. 6*, 1830.

Relief under new Scheme, *Aug. 5*, 1521.

Irish Rural Districts—Need for Small Schools *Aug. 5*, 1557.

Labourers Acts Loans, Capital Duty on, *Aug 5*, 1557, 1558.

National Debt, Reduction of, *July 30*, 819, 820.

National Telephone Company Agreements, Stamp Duty on, *July 25*, 117.

Post Office Savings Bank—Financial Position, *July 30*, 770.

Revenue from Food, Drink, and Tobacco, *July 26*, 243.

Silver Coins issued by certain Countries, *July 26*, 242.

Silver Manufactured, Duty on and Revenue from Licenses, *July 29*, 441, *July 31*, 936.

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Effect on existing Contracts, *Aug. 1*, 1214.

Small Land Holders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1574-1576, 1695.

Sugar Duty—Irish Contribution, *July 29*, 442.

Supply—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 30*, 924.

Tea Duty—Irish Contribution, *July 29*, 442.

Wheat Duty, Revenue from, *July 25*, 118.

Atkinson, Lord

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1718-1728, 1769.

Attorney-General

Sir J. Walton.

Attorney-General for Ireland

Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Australia

[*See also names of States*].

British Trade—Report Presented, *July 25*, 3, 109.

Naval Vessels for, proposed.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 30*, 723, 724; Lord Tweedmouth, 727; Lord Ellenborough, 730, 731.

Australian States Constitution Bill

c. Com., July 31, 1129.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Auxiliary Forces

See under Army, *also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry.

Avebury, Lord

Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill, *July 30*, 702-704.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 1152.

Lights on Vehicles Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 6, *Com., July 30*, 706, 707, 710,

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire., N., Chorley]

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill 2R., *July 31*, 1126.

Eltham Common—Decision as to War Office Works, *Aug. 1*, 1207.

Hague Conference Resolution as to Limitation of Armament, Terms of *Aug. 1*, 1212.

Panama Canal—Supervision of Trinidad Labour Contract, *July 30*, 763.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1454.

Transvaal Loan of £5,000,000—Date of Laying Papers, *Aug. 5*, 1531.

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1463.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [London].

Agriculture Department, Administrative Policy of, *July 25*, 187.

Bills to be proceeded with, *July 26*, 250-252.

Business of the House

Course of, *July 25*, 153, 154; *July 29*, 499.

Legislative Programme for Next Session, *July 26*, 259.

State of—Failure to carry out Programme, etc., *July 26*, 252-254.

Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1674.

Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 30*, 839-841.

Merionethshire Teachers, Salaries of, *Aug. 5*, 1658-1662.

Naval Repairs—Policy and Expenditure, *July 31*, 1022.

Parliamentary Procedure

Curtailment of Liberty of Debate under New Rules, *July 26*, 255, 256, 258.

Session, Duration of, *July 26*, 249, 251.

School Building Grant, proposals for, *July 29*, 491.

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1671.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Aug. 6*, 1866-1867, 1887-1893, 1895, 1918.

Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1566-1574, 1608-1610, 1619, 1620.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendts., *July 30*, 909.

Treasury Subventions to Ireland, *July 25*, 188-192, 194.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Fatal Accidents (Damages) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1692–1694, 1696.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 1149–1151, 1155.
Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 929–931.
Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1161–1169, 1173.

Ballinamona
Sale proposals for.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1840.

Ballybricken Estate
Sale of.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1222.

Ballydoyle Estate
Ladd, R. V., Case of.
Os. Viscount Castlereagh ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug.* 1, 1225–1227.
Purchase of.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1202.

Ballyquaide Glebe
Repayments towards Capital.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1200.

Ballywillan
Case of J. Finnigan.
Q. Mr. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 148.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [London, City of]
Business, Method of Conducting, *July 26*, 273, 274.
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 353, 358.
Committee, Scottish Grand, obstruction in, *July 26*, 272.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 543.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1943, 1947.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1876, 1910–1912.
  Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1610–1613, 1617.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 366.

Bann River
Drainage, Cost and Method of carrying out.
Qs. Mr. C. Craig, *July 25*, 204–206 ; Mr. Birrell, 206, 207.

Bar of Slattenagh
Postal Facilities.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Aug. 1*, 1194, 1195.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1943, 1950, 1955, 1963, 1966.

Barnes, Mr. J. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Naval Dockyard Wages—Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1032.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
Agriculture Department, Administrative Policy of, *July 25*, 197, 198.
Belfast Constabulary Disturbances, *July 25*, 227.
Buncrana Telephone Facilities, *July 29*, 440.
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 295, 305, 307, 318, 345.
Chief Secretary, Policy of, *July 25*, 226–228.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 556–558, 574.

Barry, Mr. R. *Solicitor-General for Ireland*—[Tyrone, N.]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 675.
Prisons (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1457.

Barrymore, Lord
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1746–1753.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]
Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1125, 1126.
St. Helena—Flax Cultivation, *Aug. 1*, 1207, 1208.

Beauchamp, Earl
Lights on Vehicles Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 8 ; *Com.*, *July 30*, 705, 706, 707, 709, 710, 711.
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1486.
Released Persons (Poor Law) Relief Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1488.

Beaumont, Mr. H. [Sussex, Eastbourne]
Burial Grounds of Religious Institutions, Use of, *July 25*, 109.
Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 30*, 866.

Bee Keeping
Foul Brood, Measures for dealing with.
Q. Mr. Lardner ; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 30*, 746.

Beer
Hawking in London.
Q. Mr. T. Davies ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31*, 953.

Beet, Sugar
See Sugar Beet.

Belfast
Constabulary Disturbances.
Qs. Mr. J. Devlin, *July 25*, 207 ; Mr. Birrell, 226 ; Mr. Barrie, 227 ; Mr. Byles, 228.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Devlin ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 149.
Qs. Mr. Myer, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Lundon, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Moore ; *As.* Mr. Cherry, Mr. Speaker, *Aug. 6*, 1847, 1848.
Proposals for Inquiry, etc.
Qs. Mr. Sloane ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1228.
Dock Strike, Measures taken to cope with.
O. Mr. J. Devlin, *July 25*, 207, 208 ; Mr. Shackleton, 216, 217 ; Mr. G. Clark, 219.
Qs. Mr. Curran ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1227, 1228.
Qs. Mr. Curran, Mr. Crooks ; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1847, 1848.
Food, etc.—Inspection by Veterinary Surgeon.
Q. Mr. Sloane ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1201.
Harbour Trust.
Q. Mr. Sloane ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 450.
Health Commission
Constitution of.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1200, 1201.
Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1523.
Outworkers, Regulations as to Work of.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 25*, 116.
Tramway Contract, Allocation of.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 121.
Welsh Children, Case of.
Q. Mr. C. Craig ; A. Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 968.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
Coins, Silver, used by certain Countries, *July 26*, 242.
Colonial Naval Defence, *July 29*, 461.
Explosives—Date of Presenting Report of Rayleigh Committee, *July 29*, 463.
Hague Conference, Subjects to be discussed at, *July 25*, 132.
Japanese Battleships, Armament of, *July 31*, 947.
Navigation and Shipping Returns—Figures given in Annual Statement, *July 29*, 488.
Navy
"Ariel," Loss of—Reason for not holding Court-Martial, *July 29*, 461.
Battleships—Return, Classification of Ships in, *July 31*, 1009.

Bellairs, Mr. C.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Channel Fleet—Regulations governing Absence of Ships, *July 30*, 749.
Cruisers—Construction Programme, *July 31*, 1013–1015.
Magazines, Refrigerating Machinery for, *July 31*, 1010, 1011.
"New Zealand"—Time occupied in Repairs, *July 30*, 748.
Repairs, Policy as to, and Expenditure on, *July 31*, 1015, 1016.
Strength, *July 81*, 1009.
Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy as to, *July 31*, 1011, 1012.

Ben Nevis
Observatories, Grant for.
Qs. Sir J. Dewar, Major Anstruther-Gray ; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 1*, 1213.

Benmore
Assault on T. Corcoran.
Q. Mr. C. Craig ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 969, 970.

Benn, Sir J. W. [Devonport]
Naval Dockyard Discharges and Rate of Wages paid, *July 31*, 1030-1032.

Berkshire
Charities—Return Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1514.

Bermondsey
Tanner Street Workhouse—Discharges and Re-admissions.
Q. Mr. Alden ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 29*, 488, 489.

Bettyville
Case of E. Hartigan.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1841.

Bills
Carrying over from one Session to another, proposed.
Os. Mr. S. T. Evans, *July 26*, 266 ; Mr. Pirie, 269.
Date of sending Measures to the House of Lords, and time allowed for discussion.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 30*, 732-734 ; Marquess of Ripon, 734–737 ; Lord Newton, 737.
Measures not to be proceeded with.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 245 ; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 264, 265 ; Mr. Pirie, 270.
Measures to be proceeded with.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 246-249 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 250–252.
Postponement of Measures involving Financial Considerations proposed.
Q. Mr. Fell ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 5*, 1562.

[*cont.*

Bills—*cont.*
- Printing to show what parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed.
  - *Os.* Earl of Camperdown, *July 29*, 395, 400–402; Earl of Crewe, 396, 402; Earl of Mayo, 397; Marquess of Lansdown, 397; Marquess of Ripon, 397; Earl Cawdor, 398; Lord James of Hereford, 398; Lord Newton, 398; Lord Tweedmouth, 399; Viscount Midleton, 399; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 399; Lord Courtney, 401; Lord Ampthill, 402.
- Private Members' Bills, Proposals as to Starring.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *July 26*, 277; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 287.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill
- c. *Rep.* July 26*, 239.
- *Con.* Aug. 2*, 1375.
- 3R.* *Aug. 6*, 1805.

Birmingham
- Post Office—Pay of Wiremen.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 13*, 935.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
- Abbeyleix—Cause of injury to Filly, *July 31*, 967.
- Agrarian Outrages—Number reported in 1906 and 1907, *July 25*, 112, 147; *Aug. 5*, 1525.
- Agriculture Committees, Audit Fees paid by, *Aug. 5*, 1528.
- Ancketill Grove, Disposal of, *July 30*, 783.
- Ballybricken Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 1*, 1222.
- Ballydoyle Estate
  - Ladd, R. V., Case of, *Aug. 1*, 1226, 1227.
  - Purchase of, *Aug. 1*, 1202.
- Ballyquaide Glebe—Repayments towards Capital, *Aug. 1*, 1200.
- Ballywillan—Case of J. Fonnegan, *July 25*, 148.
- Bann River Drainage—Cost and Method of Carrying out, *July 25*, 206, 207.
- Belfast
  - Constabulary Disturbances, *July 25*, 149, 226.
    - Inquiry, Proposals for, *Aug. 1*, 1228.
  - Dock Strike—Present Position, *Aug. 1*, 1227, 1228.
  - Food Inspection System, *Aug. 1*, 1201.
  - Health Commission
    - Constitution of, *Aug. 1*, 1201.
    - Report, Date of Presenting, *Aug. 5*, 1523.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Belfast—*cont.*
  - Tramway Contract, Allocation of, *July 25*, 121.
  - Welsh Children, Case of, *July 31*, 968.
- Benmore—Assault on T. Corcoran, *July 31*, 970.
- Bloomfield Estate—Disposal of Castlecaldwell Lands, *Aug. 2*, 1382.
- Bogtown—Case of Mrs. McConnor, *July 30*, 782.
- Borrisokane Police Force on 7th August, *July 31*, 970.
- Caldbeck Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 5*, 1529.
- Carrick-on-Shannon—Reinstatement Claims of C. Glancy, P. Moran and M. Duffy, *July 30*, 782.
- Clanmorris Estate, Purchase of, *Aug. 1*, 1192.
- Condition of Ireland—Persons receiving Police Protection, *July 25*, 120.
- Constabulary
  - Duties on Farms from which Cattle have been Driven, *July 3*, 966.
  - Inspectors, System of Appointing, *July 29*, 459.
  - McGovern, T., Case of, July *31*, 939.
- Coolcuslough Mountain—Cause of Outrage on 21st inst., *July 31*, 969.
- *Daily Graphic*—Picture published on 20th inst., *July 25*, 150, 151.
- Douglas Estate Untenanted Land, Sale of, *Aug. 6*, 1815.
- Dromulton—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. T. Brosnan, *Aug. 5*, 1522.
- Drumraney Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *Aug. 2*, 1382.
- Dunraven Estate—Case of J. Micks, *Aug. 1*, 1223.
- Economic and Industrial Condition, *July 25*, 220.
- Education
  - Amalgamation of Schools, Proposals for, *Aug. 5*, 1515.
  - Commissioners, Power to Demand Resignation of, *July 31*, 967, 968.
  - Gardening, Instruction in, *July 25*, 147.
  - Inspectors, System of Appointing, *July 29*, 458.
    - Junior, System of Appointing, *Aug. 5*, 1523.
  - National School Teachers
    - Awards to *Aug. 1*, 1203.
    - Civil Rights, *July 26*, 243; *July 30*, 784.
    - Junior Assistants, Work of, *July 31*, 938.
    - Pensions Awarded, *Aug. 6*, 1808.
    - Promotion System, *Aug. 5*, 1529.
    - Salaries, Period for Paying, *July 29*, 447.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

Education—*cont.*

Schools with Average Attendance below Fifty, Assistant Mistresses for, *Aug. 2*, 1382.

Votes, Comparison of, *July 29*, 445.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *29*, 504–506, 523, 541, 542, 552, 553, 554, 555, 569; 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1427–1438.

Clause 12—Ballymena Rural Council Resolution, *Aug.* 1, 1223.

Grazing Districts, Disturbances in, *July 25*, 221–226.

Herbert Estate, Sale of, *July 29*, 444.

Hyde Estate—Case of T. Bullman, *July 31*, 940.

Kilbride—Case of Miss A. Connor, *July 25*, 148.

Kilbroney—Case of J. McGuill, *Aug. 1*, 1225.

Kinvara Crops; Condition of, *July 29*, 444.

Knockanes—Case of D. Healy, *Aug. 6*, 1815.

Labourers Acts, Clause 19, Advances under, *July 31*, 971.

Land Commission—Book-keeping System, *Aug. 5*, 1522.

Land Purchase — Fee for Registering Titles, *July 29*, 447.

Lisiniska Constabulary Post — Cases of Coughlin and Kilcawley, *Aug. 5*, 1524.

Lislea—Case of H. McCabe, *July 29*, 460

Mahoney Estate, Sale of, *July 25*, 146.

Maryborough—Case of T. L. Hodgins, *July 31*, 966.

Meelin—Police Protection of Mr. O. Daly, *July 31*, 965.

Morrogh Bernard Estate, Sale of—Cases of M. and T. Buckley, *Aug. 1*, 1221, 1222.

O'Donoghue Estate—Case of D. Dineen, *Aug. 1*, 1221.

Poor Law

Case of E. Farrell, *July 30*, 781.

Clerks of Unions, System of Appointing, *Aug. 5*, 1526.

Inspectors, Number of, *Aug. 1*, 1225.

Rating System, Revision of, *July 30*, 783.

Roads Boat Slip Improvement, *Aug. 5*, 1522.

Roe Estate, Sale of, *July 30*, 781.

Roskeen — Reinstatement Application of Mrs. Delany, *Aug 5*, 1529.

Shrove School Teacher, Payments to, *July 31*, 939.

Singleton Estate—Case of J. R. O'Sullivan, *July 29*, 446.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

Stokes Estate—Case of J. Monaghan, *Aug. 1*, 1221.

Tallow—Case of Mr. Cleary, *Aug. 5*, 1527.

Tarbert, Railway Extension to, *Aug. 6*, 1816.

Upton Estate, Sale of, etc., *July 25*, 146.

Warrenford Estate, Owner of, *Aug. 1*, 1200.

Waterford Asylum — Superintendent's Powers as to exclusion of certain Newspaper, *Aug. 1*, 1224.

Whitechurch—Case of J. Ambrose, *July 29*, 459.

Births

Ireland—Report (1906) Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1470, 1514.

Scotland—Report Presented, *July 29*, 384, 439.

Blind Persons

Government Assistance to.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 6*, 1814.

Number in County of London and Government Assistance to.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 1*, 1198.

Bloomfield Estate

Castlecaldwell Lands, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 2*, 1381, 1382.

Blyth, Baron

Introduced to House of Lords, *Aug. 1*, 1137.

Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill

l. Com. and *Rep.** *July 25*, 2.
3R.* *July 29*, 378.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Bogtown

Second Term Rent of Mrs. M. Connor.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 781, 782.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]

Gaelic League, Educational Work of, *July 31*, 973.

Low Valley, Roman Catholic School, *July 25*, 230–232.

Mackerel—Irish Trade with United States, *July 30*, 766.

Mahoney Estate, Sale of, *July 25*, 146.

Mauritius — Case of Mr. Cameron, *July 31*, 952.

Roads Boat Slip Improvements, *Aug. 5*, 1522.

Borneo
Brunei, Money lent to.
Qs. Mr. Wedgwood ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 761, 762.

Borrisokane
Police Force on 7th August.
Q. Mr. Hogan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 970.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 595, 531–533, 670, 678.

Boulton, Mr. A. C. F. [Hunts, Ramsey]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 690.
Postage Rates to Canada, *July 30*, 776.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, Norwood]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 310, 322, 349, 359.
Consolidated Fund, Allowances paid out of, *July 30*, 770, 771.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 666, 671, 681.
Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill, *Con.*, *July 31*, 1126, 1127, 1129.
Finance Accounts—Estimate of Contingent Liabilities, *Aug. 6*, 1829.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug.* 6, 1960.
Navy
Cordite, Tests for, *July 31*, 1044, 1045.
Magazines, Refrigerating Machinery for, *July 31*, 1044.
Parliamentary Procedure — Anticipatory Motions Committee Recommendations, *July 29*, 499 ; *Aug. 5*, 1561.
Post Office Savings Bank — Financial Position, *July 30*, 769.
Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1454.
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 2*, 1468.
Shetland Fisheries—Effect of Destruction of Whales, *Aug. 5*, 1547.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, Expenditure under, *July 25*, 134.
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1464.

Boxes
Imported—Regulation as to marking.
Q. Mr. Hay ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 442.

Brace, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, S.]
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1345–1349, 1355, 1367.
Committee Stage, Date of, *July 26*, 268.

Bramsdon, Mr. T. A. [Portsmouth]
African Steamship Company, British Government Payments to, *Aug. 6*, 1827.
Congo Free State—Consular Representation in United Kingdon, *Aug. 6*, 1825.
Naval Dockyards
Private Yards, Allocation of Work to, *July 31*, 1035.
Wages—Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1036.

Branch, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Enfield]
Army—Orders for Lee-Enfield Rifles, *Aug. 6*, 1810

Brassey, Lord
Australia, Naval Vessels for, proposed, *July 30*, 723, 724.
Colonial Naval Reserves, Progress made with enrolment, *July 30*, 721, 722.
Merchant Shipping—All-British Route to the East, *July 30*, 724.
Naval Reserve, Strength of, *July 30*, 722.

Brazil
Trade Report Presented, *July 29*, 383 ; *July 31*, 926.

Brewsterfield
Sale of Mr. Orpon's Estate.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1550.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Education Board Medical Department, Cost of, *July 25*, 141.
Glamorganshire Non-provided Schools, Estimate for, *July 25*, 141.
Monmouthshire Schools Expenditure, *July 25*, 142.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorks., W.R., Keighley]
Railways — Method of dealing with Traders' Complaints, *July 31*, 955.

Brighouse Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

British Museum
Vote for, *July 31*, 1065 ; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

British North America Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *Aug. 2*, 1456.

Broadmoor Asylum
Doughty, Florence, Case of.
Q. Mr. Harnood - Banner ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 1*, 1214.

Broadstairs and St. Peters Urban District Water Bill
c. *Rep.* July 25*, 107.
Com. July 31*, 932.
3R.* *Aug.* 5, 1513.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 6*, 1689.

Broughton
- School Staff.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25*, 111.

Bryce, Mr. J. A. [Inverness, Burghs]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 336.

Buchannan, Mr. T. R.—*Financial Secretary, War Office* [Perthshire, E.]
- Militia
  - Irish, Proposals as to, *July 25*, 126.
  - Recruiting, Date of Stopping, *July 25*, 125, 126.
- Soldiers, Civil Employment of—Case of Sergeant at North Wall, *July 25*, 126, 127.
- Tidworth Barracks Accommodation, *July 25*, 126.
- War Office Contracts — Fines Paid by Messrs. Meyer and Stepney, *July 25*, 125.
- Woolwich Arsenal, Minimum Establishment, *July 25*, 124, 125.

Buckmaster, Mr. S. O. [Cambridge]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 595–598.

Bude Gas Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Buncrana
- Telephone Facilities.
  - *Q.* Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 440.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1941, 1964.

Burial Grounds
- Private Grounds of Religious Institutions, Use of.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Beaumont; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 25*, 109.

Burma
- Lanmadaw—Cause for Eviction of Tenants.
  - *Qs.* Sir J. Jardine, Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Aug. 6*, 1820, 1821.

Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
- Bermondsey—Discharges from Tanner St. Workhouse, *July 29*, 489.
- Burial Grounds of Religious Institutions, Use of, *July 25*, 109.
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 320, 341–343, 349, 355.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Carshalton Hospital
  - Annual Cost of, *Aug. 1*, 1197.
  - Use for, *July 25*, 110.
- Coffee Adulteration with Chicory, *Aug. 6*, 1833.
- Croydon Vaccination Case — Cause of Death of Boy, *July 30*, 774.
- Deaths
  - Number owing to certain Occupations, *July 30*, 773.
  - Tuberculous Foods, Number caused by, *July 30*, 745.
- "Exmouth" Annual Inspection — Payment of Luncheons of Visitors, *Aug. 1*, 1214.
- Hampstead Borough Council; Labourers discharged by, *Aug. 6*, 1814.
- Local Authorities' Travelling Expenses, Payment of, *July 25*, 110.
- Local Government Board
  - Drainage of Buildings, Powers as to, *Aug. 6*, 1814.
  - Ridley Clerks, Position of, *Aug. 5*, 1519, 1520.
- Main roads, Maintenance of, *July 30*, 773.
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1944, 1958, 1963, 1967.
- Mile End Poor Law Guardians Contracts, *July 31*, 942.
- Parliamentary Elections—Second Ballot System, *July 29*, 441.
- Poor Law
  - Children Boarded-out—Regulations as to Religion of Foster-Parents, *July 29*, 489.
  - Shirley Schools, Expenditure on, *Aug. 6*, 1832.
- Public Health Acts—Complaints against Local Councils, *Aug. 1*, 1196.
- Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug 2*, 1443–1451, 1455.
- Unemployed
  - Central Body, Circulation of Resolution of, *Aug. 1*, 1215.
  - Exchange Registries — Attitude towards Labour Disputes, *Aug. 1*, 1215.
  - Grant, Proposals for, *Aug. 6*, 1833, 1834.

Burwell Farm
- Compensation Paid to outgoing Tenant.
  - *Q.* Mr. Gretton; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 31*, 941.

Business of the House
Course of.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Moore, *July 25*, 153, 154 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *July 29*, 499, 500 ; Sir A. Acland-Hood, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 31*, 976 ; Mr. A. Douglas, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 1*, 1232, 1233
Government Business not to be interrupted for the remainder of the Session
Resolution [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman] *July 26*, 244–249.
Legislative Programme for next Session.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 257.
Method of conducting, Necessity for Alteration in.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 26*, 261, 262 ; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 262–264 ; Mr. S. T. Evans, 266 ; Mr. Chaplin, 267 ; Sir F. Banbury, 273, 274 ; Mr. Findlay, 274 ; Lord R. Cecil, 282–284 ; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 284–287.
State of—Failure to carry out Programme, etc.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 252–254 ; Mr. Asquith, 259–261 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 277–282.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
Agriculture Department
Vice-President—Making a Non-Parliamentary Office, proposed, *July 25*, 181.
Working of—Report, etc., of Committee, *July 25*, 179–183.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1404–1407.
Training College Candidates, Interviews with, *July 31*, 957.
Treasury Subventions to Ireland, *July 25*, 182, 183.

Butter
Irish—Railway Delays in Transit.
Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 487.

Butter and Margarine Bill
c. Con., July 26, 295.
3R.* *July 26*, 365.
l. 1R.* *July 29*, 384.
2R., *Aug. 1*, 1177.
Recommittal to a Select Committee, proposed.
Os. Mr. Barrie, *July 26*, 295–297 ; Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Sir E. Strachey, 298 ; Sir F. Lowe, 299 ; Mr. Flynn, 298.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Bar of Slattenagh Postal Facilities, *Aug. 1*, 1195.
Birmingham Post Office—Pay of Wiremen, *July 31*, 935.
Buncrana Telephone Facilities, *July 29*, 440.
Cloughfin Postal Facilities, *July 25*, 117.
Favouritism in the Post Office, Allegations as to, *July 26*, 241.
Letterboxes of Sub-Postmasters, painting of, *Aug. 6*, 1808.
Mail Service Route to Shanghai and Hong Kong, *Aug. 2*, 1377–1379.
Telephone Service—Provincial Charges, *July 29*, 440.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]
Africa, West—Labour in San Thomé and Principé, *July 30*, 740.
Belfast, Constabulary Disturbances, *July 25*, 228.
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con., July 26*, 303.
Corn Tax, *July 30*, 790, 798.
Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 790, 798–800.
Hague Conference, Subjects discussed at, *July 25*, 131.
Parliamentary Debates, Reporting of, *July 29*, 496.
Police, Metropolitan—Case of G. Deed, *Aug. 6*, 1808.
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, *Con., July 26*, 372.
Sugar Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *July 30*, 799.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Date of considering Lords' Amendments, *July 29*, 496.

Cabs and Stage Carriages (London) Bill
c. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 1234.

Caithness
Postal Mail Delays in Tourist Season.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason ; *A.* Captain Norton, *July 29*, 492.

Caldbeck Estate
Sale of.
Q. Mr. Delaney ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1529.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]
Bills
Measures not to be proceeded with, *July 26*, 245.
Measures to be Proceeded with, *July 26*, 246–249.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. —*cont.*

- Bills—*cont.*
  - Postponement of Measures Involving Financial Considerations, *Aug. 5*, 1562.
  - Private Member's Bills, Proposals as to Starring, *July 26*, 287.
- Business of the House
  - Course of, *July 25*, 153, 154; *July 29*, 499, 500; *July 31*, 976; *Aug. 1*, 1232, 1233.
  - Government Business not to be Interrupted for the remainder of the Session, *July 26*, 244–249.
  - Method of Conducting, Necessity for Alteration in, *July 26*, 284–287.
- Civil List Pensions as Shewn in Finance Accounts, *Aug. 6*, 1845, 1846.
- Civil Service Grievances, Tribunal to Inquire into, Proposed, *July 31*, 974, 975.
- Committee, Scottish Grand, Obstruction in, *July 26*, 285.
- Companies Bill—Date of Second Reading, *Aug. 5*, 1561.
- Conferment of Honours—Setting out Public Services in Patents, Proposed, *July 31*, 973, 974.
- Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 30*, 835–839.
- D'Averquerque, Lord, Pension of, *Aug. 6*, 1844.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Method of raising Money, *Aug. 5*, 1562.
- Land Values (Scotland) Bill—Reply to Deputation of 28th ult., *July 25*, 151.
- Liquor Traffic—Scottish Legislative Proposals, *July 29*, 497.
- London Legislative Measures, Time Allotted to, *July 29*, 497.
- Magistrates Appointed since 1906, *July 25*, 152.
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, Facilities for, *Aug, 6*, 1844.
- Pacific Cable Board—Emoluments of Sir H. Primrose, *Aug. 1*, 1192.
- Parliamentary Debates, Reporting of, *July 29*, 496.
- Parliamentary Election—Second Ballot System, *July 31*, 974.
- Parliamentary Procedure
  - Anticipatory Motions Committee Recommendations, *July 29*, 498, 499; *Aug. 5*, 1561.
  - Session, Duration of, *July 26*, 245, 249.
- Pensions paid to Heirs of certain Peers, *July 31*, 937, 976.
- Postal Employees' Grievances—Recommendations of Committee, *July 29*, 498.
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Discussion of, *July 29*, 499; *Aug. 5*, 1561.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. —*cont.*

- Shetland, Norwegian Claims to, *Aug. 5*, 1562.
- Sittings of the House
  - Relief of Officials during Long Sittings, *Aug. 1*, 1231.
  - Saturday Sittings, Proposals for, *July 25*, 152.
- Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1663, 1665, 1669, 1672.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
  - Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1563–1565, 1608, 1614–1616, 1618, 1620.
  - Date of taking Report Stage, *Aug. 1*, 1230.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Date of considering Lords' Amendments, *July 29*, 497.
- Transvaal Loan of £5,000,000—Date of Introducing Bill, *July 25*, 152, 153.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Opportunity for Discussion, *Aug. 1*, 1231, 1232.

Camperdown, Earl of

- Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R. *July 29*, 382, 383.
- Bills—Printing to show what parts have been passed, by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 395, 400, 402.
- Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1170, 1171.

Canary Islands

- Trade Report Presented, *July 31*, 926.

Canterbury, Archbishop of

- Congo Free State Administration, *July 29*, 412.
- Training Colleges
  - Hostels, Decision as to, *July 25*, 32.
  - New Regulations—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 29–44.
  - Trust Deeds, Responsibility for carrying out, *July 25*, 42.

Cape Colony

- Trade Statistics for 1907.
  - *Qs.* Sir E. Parker; *As.* Mr. Kearley, *Aug. 1*, 1216, 1217.

Carnarvon

- Estate Duties paid (1901–6).
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 31*, 944.

Carr-Gomm, Mr. H. W. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]

- Unemployed
  - Central Body Resolutions, Circulation of, *Aug. 1*, 1215.
  - Exchange Registries—Attitude towards Labour Disputes, *Aug. 1*, 1215.

Carrick-on-Shannon
Reinstatement Claims of C. Glancy, P. Moran and M. Duffy.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 782.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture*
Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *Aug.* 1, 1177.

Carshalton Hospital
Annual Cost of.
Q. Dr. Cooper ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 1*, 1197.
Use for.
Q. Mr. Cleland ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 25*, 110.

Castlereagh, Viscount [Maidstone]
Ballydoyle Estate—Case of R. V. Ladd, *Aug. 1*, 1225, 1227.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 550, 554, 555, 558, 559 ; 3R., *Aug.* 2, 1385–1392.

Cavan
Militia Barracks, Condition of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 469.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 643, 645, 668, 675, 687.
Merionethshire School Teachers, Salaries of, *Aug. 5*, 1655.
Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1453.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1664.

Cavendish, Rt. Hon. V. C. W. [Derbyshire, W.]
Public Accounts Committee Report, Discussion of, *July 29*, 499.
Supply—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 30*, 923, 924 ; *July 31*, 1133.

Cawdor, Earl
Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 383.
Bills—Printing to show what parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 398.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
British North America Bill, Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *Aug. 2*, 1456.
Business, Method of Conducting, *July 26*, 282–284.
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 309, 315, 316, 317, 322.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 589, 633, 641.
Explosives—Date of Presenting Report of Rayleigh Committee, *July 29*, 463.

Cecil, Lord R.—*cont.*
Income Tax Abatements, Delay in Paying, *Aug. 6*, 1830.
London Legislative Measures, Time allotted to, *July 29*, 497.
Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *July 31*, 959, 961 ; *Aug. 5*, 1539–1542, 1563, 1629–1634, 1639, 1641, 1649.
Parliamentary Procedure — Anticipatory Motions Committee Recommendation, *July 29*, 499.
Prisons (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1457.
Questions — Absence of Ministers addressed, *Aug. 6*, 1846.
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 2*, 1467.
Shetland Fisheries—Effect of Destruction of Whales, *Aug. 5*, 1546.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1613, 1614, 1616.
Swansea Education Dispute, *Aug. 6*, 1834.
Training College Candidates, Interviews with, *July 31*, 958.
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R , *Aug. 2*, 1459, 1460, 1461.
Resolution, *Aug. 6*, 1987.
Wrexham Parochial Charities Scheme, *July 30*, 778.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
Income Tax Abatements under New System, *July 25*, 133.
Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *July 31*, 961 ; *Aug. 5*, 1646–1648.
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) (Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*. 1359–1362.
Transvaal Loan of £5,000,000—Date of Introducing Bill, *July 25*, 152.

Central London Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Chairman
"Divide," Calling of, not out of Order, *July 30*, 885.
Irrelevant Matter, *July 25*, 209.
"Shameful Expenditure," Expression not Unparliamentary, *July 31*, 1043.
Unparliamentary Expressions, *July 30*, 866.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Worcestershire, E.]
Bills of, Private Members, Proposals as to Starring, *July 26*, 277.
Business, State of—Failure to carry out Programme, etc., *July 26*, 277-282.
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 335, 337, 339.
Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 823-828.

[*cont.*

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary Procedure—Curtailment of Liberty of Debate under New Rules, *July 26*, 281.
  Revenue and Expenditure — Financial Position of the Country, *July 30*, 823–825.
  Taxation, Broadening Basis of, proposed, *July 30*, 826, 827.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancester
  Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
  Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Channel Islands
  Company Law, Conference as to.
    Q. Mr. H. H. Marks ; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 30*, 774.
  Shipping Laws, Conference as to.
    Q. Sir W. J. Collins ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 942, 943.

Channing, Sir F. A. [Northants, E.]
  Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July* 26, 343.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H. [Surrey, Wimbledon]
  Business, Method of Conducting, *July 26*, 267.
  Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1664, 1665, 1670, 1677.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1861–1863.
    Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1619.

Charities
  [*See also names of counties.*]
  Ireland, Vote for, *July 31*, 1058 ; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Charity Commission
  Vote for, *July 31*, 1057 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange]
  Agrarian Outrages—Offences included in Returns, *Aug. 5*, 1551.
  Antrim Labourers' Cottages Grant, *Aug. 5*, 1548.
  Ballinamona Sale Proposals, *Aug. 6*, 1840.
  Belfast
    Constabulary Dispute—Present Position, *Aug. 6*, 1847, 1848.
    Dock Strike—Use of Troops, etc., *Aug. 6*, 1847, 1848.
  Bettyville—Case of E. Hartigan, *Aug. 6*, 1841.
  Brewsterfield—Sale of Mr. Orpon's Estate, *Aug. 5*, 1550.
  Clogher East—Case of J. O'Rourke, *Aug. 6*, 1839.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*cont.*
  Constabulary
    Cruise, District Inspector, Complaints against, *Aug. 5*, 1554.
    Increase, Proposals for, *Aug. 5*, 1551.
  Cooper Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 6*, 1841.
  Crown Prosecutions in 1907, *Aug. 6*, 1836.
  Daily Graphic Picture of 26th inst., *July 30*, 779, 780.
  Delmege Estate Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *Aug. 6*, 1842.
  Education Inspectors' Grievances, Inquiry into, *Aug. 5*, 1549.
  Edwards' Estate—Case of P. Dempsey, *Aug. 6*, 1837.
  Erasmus Smith Property, Sale of, *Aug. 6*, 1841.
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*. 519, 520, 535, 539, 548, 549, 554, 558 ; 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1418.
  Galway, Leitrim, Roscommon, and Sligo, Condition of, *Aug. 5*. 1552.
  Kilcoleman Patrickswell — Case of Mr. O'Farrel, *Aug. 6*, 1840.
  Kilkeel Labourers' Cottages Grant, *Aug. 5*, 1548.
  Kilrush Insanitary Houses, *Aug. 6*, 1838.
  Labourers Acts Inspectors—Adequacy of Staff, *Aug. 6*, 1838.
  Land Purchase—Intimidation of Graziers, etc., Measures for dealing with, *Aug. 5*, 1549, 1550.
  Lismacanigan and Dungimmon—Police Attendance at Meetings, *Aug. 5*, 1555, 1556.
  MacDonnell, Sir A., Cause of Visit of, *Aug. 6*, 1838.
  Mitchelstown—Kingston College Trust, *Aug. 5*, 1553.
  Poor Law Medical Service—Mr. O'Carroll's suggestion, *Aug. 6*, 1839.
  Reddy, Mr., Speeches of—Action of Lord Chancellor, etc., *Aug. 5*, 1556, 1557.

Chester-le-Street
  Vaccination Exemption Cases.
    Q. Mr. J. W. Taylor ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 25*, 138, 139.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
  Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

China
  Opium *see that title.*
  Shanghai Opium Houses, Closing of.
    Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Sir. E. Grey, *July 25*, 115.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies.* [Manchester, N.W.]
  Africa, Projected Visit to, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
  Africa, Central—Troops at Zomba, *July 30*, 761.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*

- Africa, South—Rebate of Customs Duties on Goods for Garrison, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
- African Hut Tax, Amount of, *July 29*, 480.
- Australian States Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *July 31*, 1130, 1131.
- British North America Bill, Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *Aug. 2*, 1456.
- Brunei, Money lent to, *July 30*, 761, 762.
- Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill. 2R., *July 31*, 1112.
- Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill, *Con.*, *July 31*, 1127.
- Indian Rupees, Profit on Coining, *July 29*, 480, 481.
- Lagos
  - Import Duty on Spirits, *Aug. 1*, 1209.
  - Timber Concession to Mr. Brown, *July 29*, 479.
- Malta—Marriage Fees, *Aug. 5*, 1518.
- Mauritius—Case of Mr. Cameron, *July 31*, 952.
- Natal War Contribution, *July 31*, 951.
- New Hebrides
  - Convention, Delay in Proclaiming and Alterations made in, *July 30*, 763.
  - French Contraband Trade, Effect of, *July 29*, 481.
  - Native Labour Inspection System, *July 31*, 950.
- Nigeria
  - Drink Traffic in, *Aug. 5*, 1536.
  - Railways
    - Construction in the North, *Aug. 5*, 1532, 1534.
    - Rates in South Nigeria, *Aug. 1*, 1208, 1209.
- Orange River Colony
  - Congress of Orangia Union, Resolutions of, *Aug. 5*, 1532, 1533.
  - Farms, Valuation of, *July 31*, 951.
  - Loan Projected for, *July 31*, 952.
- Panama Canal
  - British Subjects employed on, *July 29*, 479.
  - Jamaican Labour, Negotiations as to, *Aug. 6*, 1823.
  - Trinidad Labour
    - Contract, Supervision of, *July 30*, 761–763; *July 31*, 950.
    - Holidays Granted, *Aug. 2*, 1381.
- St. Helena
  - Flax Cultivation, *Aug. 1*, 1193, 1208.
  - Water Tax, Revenue from, *July 31*, 951.
- Straits Settlements—Gambling in Federated Malay States, *July 29*, 476,

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*

- Sugar, Brussels Convention—Representations from Chambers of Commerce, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
- Transvaal
  - British Civil Servants, Position of, *July 30*, 764.
  - British Indians, Position of, *Aug. 5*, 1534.
  - Chinese Labour—Speeches in Transvaal Debate, *July 29*, 475.
  - Fitzpatrick, Sir P., Attack by, *July 31*, 971.
  - Liquor Supply to Natives—Legislative Proposals, *July 29*, 478.
  - Loan of £5,000,000
    - Application of, *Aug. 5*, 1531.
    - Papers, Date of Laying, *Aug. 5*, 1532.
    - Transvaal Bill, Contents of, *July 29*, 475.
  - Mines—Native Labour Supply, *July 29*, 476–478.
  - Money Outstanding on Old Loan, *July 30*, 743.
  - Officials Transferred to, Position of, *July 30*, 764.
  - White Labour in Mines, Restrictions on, *July 30*, 760.
- Uganda Railway Annuities, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
- Zanzibar—Abolition of Slavery on Coast Strip, *July 31*, 952, 953.

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill

- c. *Rep.*,* *July 30*, 739.
  - *Con.*,* *Aug. 6*, 1806.

Civil Contingencies Fund

- Repayments to, Vote for, *July 31*, 1080; *Aug. 1*, 1239.

Civil List

- Pensions as shown in Finance Accounts.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lea; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 6*, 1844–1846.

Civil Service

- Admissions, Transfers and Promotions during last Twenty-five Years.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 456.
- Boy Clerks from London, Preference given to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 441, 442.
- Grievances, Tribunal to Inquire into, proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Hay; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 31*, 974, 975.
- Superannuation, *see that title.*

Civil Service Commission

- Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Civil Service Estimates
- Bankruptcy Department of Board of Trade—£1,508, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- British Museum—£111,041, *Com.* July 31*, 1065 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
- Charity Commission — £15,892, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Civil Contingencies Fund Repayments—£14,439, *Com.* July 31*, 1080 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.
- Civil Service Commission—£23,750, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Colonial Office—£37,900, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Colonial Services—£910,289, *Com.* July 31*, 1071 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
- County Courts—£3, *Com.* July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
- Cyprus Grant in Aid—£1,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1071 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
- Diplomatic and Consular Services — £319,340, *Com.* July 31*, 1071 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
- Education Board—£6,793,646, *Com.* July 31*, 1065 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
- Foreign Office—£40,698, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Friendly Societies Registry—£5,624, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Harbours—£16,740, *Com.* July 31*, 1052 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Home Office—£128,735, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- House of Commons Offices—£22,800, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- House of Lords Offices—£17,543, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Houses of Parliament—£5,700, *Com.* July 31*, 1052 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Ireland
  - Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department — £113,817, *Com.* July 25*, 159.
  - Charitable Donations and Bequests Office—£1,051, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  - Chief Secretary—£17,756, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  - Chief Secretary, Salaries and Expenses ; and Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums—£17,756, *Com., July 25*, 202.
  - County Courts—£66,298, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Development Grant—£85,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1080 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
  - Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum—£3,262, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
- Ireland—*cont.*
  - Education—£648,360, *Com.* July 31*, 1067 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Endowed Schools Commissioners—£510, *Com.* July 31*, 1067 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Hospitals and Charities—£139, *Com.* July 31*, 1076 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
  - Household of Lord - Lieutenant—£2,632, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  - Land Commission—£139,050, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Law Charges, etc.—£37,872, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - National Gallery—£1,147, *Com.* July 31*, 1067 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Prisons—£62,556, *Com.* July 31*, 1062; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Public Works and Buildings—£122,829, *Com.* July 31*, 1052 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
  - Queen's Colleges—£2,200, *Com.* July 31*, 1068 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Railways—£26,270, *Com.* July 31*, 1052 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
  - Record Office—£3,580, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  - Reformatory and Industrial Schools—£55,251, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Registrar - General—£7,332, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  - Royal Irish Constabulary—£721,499, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Supreme Court and other Legal Departments—£59,086, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  - Valuation and Boundary Survey—£14,848, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
- Jamaica Earthquake, Aid Grant—£150,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1071 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
- Land Registry—£22,813, *Com.* July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
- Law Charges—£42,774, *Com.* July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
- Local Government Board—£147,782, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Local Loans Funds Repayment—£4,601, *Com.* July 31*, 1079 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
- Lunacy Commission—£10,905, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Mercantile Marine Services—£72,816, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.

[*cont.*

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
Miscellaneous Expenses—£46,151, *Com.* July 31*, 1079 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
Miscellaneous Legal Expenses—£21,944, *Com.* July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
National Gallery—£7,233, *Com.* July 31*, 1066 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
National Portrait Gallery—£2,897, *Com.* July 31*, 1066 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
Police—£25,036, *Com., July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Post Office—£11,117,751, *Com.* July 31*, 1086 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1240.
Privy Council Office—£6,120, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
Record Office—£14,190, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Registrar-General—£25,994, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Savings Banks and Friendly Societies' Deficiences—£145,940, *Com.* July 31*, 1076 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
Scientific Investigation—£30,479, *Com.* July 31*, 1066 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
Scotland
  Crofters Commission—£2,545, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  Law Charges and Courts—£50,706, *Com.* July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  Education—£1,188,554, *Com.* July 31*, 1066 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  Lunacy Commission—*Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  National Galleries—£2,416, *Com.* July 31*, 1067 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
  Peterhead Harbour—£21,988, *Com.* July 31*, 1052 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
  Prisons—£53,650, *Com.* July 31*, 1062 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  Register House, Edinburgh—£27,700, *Com.* July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
  Registrar-General — £2,978, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Secret Service—£10,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Stationery and Printing—£418,053, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Supreme Court of Judicature—£177,556, *Com.* July 31*, 1061 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Surveys—£118,905, *Com.* July 31*, 1052 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
Telegraph Subsidies and Pacific Cable—£26,776, *Com.* July 31*, 1071 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
Temporary Commissions—£36,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1079 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.
Treasury, etc.—£60,919, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1235.
Universities and Colleges, etc.—£141,400, *Com.* July 31*, 1066 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
Wallace Collection—£3,454, *Com.* July 31*, 1066 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1237.
Woods and Forests, etc., Office—£13,398, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Workmen's Compensation Act, 1905, Expenses under—£200,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1080 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.
Works Loan Commission—£1,500, *Com.* July 31*, 1057 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.
Works and Public Buildings Office—£52,596, *Com.* July 31*, 1058 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1236.

Clancy, Mr. J. Y. [Dublin County, N.]
Agriculture Department, Administrative Policy, *July 25*, 183–186.
Treasury Subventions to Ireland, *July 25*, 184.

Clanmorris Estate
Purchase of.
  Q. Mr. Duffy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1191, 1192.

Clanricarde, Marquess of
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1759–1762.

Clark, Mr. G. [Belfast, N.]
Belfast—Dock Strike, Measures taken to Cope with, *July 25*, 219.
Chief Secretary, Policy of, *July 25*, 218.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]
Carshalton Hospital, Use for, *July 25*, 110.

Clifford of Chudleigh, Lord
Congo Free State Administration, *July 29*, 417.
Lights on Vehicles Bill, *Com., July 30*, 708, 712.

Clogher, East
Reinstatement Claim of J. O. Rourke.
  Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1839.

Clonbrock, Lord
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1742–1746.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton]
Darfield School Accommodation, *July 29*, 490.

Cloughfin
Postal Facilities.
  Q. Mr. Kettle ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 25*, 117.

Clyde Navigation Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill
c. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 1234.

Coastguard
Reorganisation Proposals.
Qs. Major Seely, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 29*, 460.
Stations Closed—Return presented, *July 25*, 108.
Stations Short of Men.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 6*, 1806, 1807.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N.]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con., July 26*, 355, 356.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Aug. 6*, 1873–1875, 1921–1926.

Coffee
Adulteration with Chicory, Protection against.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 6*, 1832, 1833.

Coinage and Currency
Copper Coins, Scarcity of.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 457.
Silver Coins issued by certain Countries.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 26*, 242.

Coleridge, Lord
Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1479.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Channel Islands Shipping Laws, *July 31*, 942.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con., July 29*, 672.
Duke of York's School—Changes projected, *July 31*, 948.
India—Tetanus in the Punjab, *July 31*, 945.
University College Grants, Report on, *July 31*, 953.

Collooney, Ballina and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill
l. 3R.* *July 30*, 697.
c. Lords' Amendts. *Con., Aug. 2*, 1375.

Colonial Audit Branch
See under Exchequer and Audit Department.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. W. L. S. Churchill.

Colonial Office—*cont.*
Under-Secretary's projected Visit to Africa.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Colonial Preference
Policy of.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 30*, 792–794; Mr. Asquith, 822, 827; Mr. Seddon, 832.

Colonial Services
Vote for, *July 31*, 1071; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

Colonies and Protectorates
[For particular Colonies, etc., *see their names.*]
Annual Report Presented, *July 25*, 3, 108; *July 29*, 383, 439; *Aug. 2*, 1376; *Aug. 5*, 1470; *Aug. 6*, 1806.
British Commercial Agents, Work of.
Qs. Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 484, 485.
Governors, System of Appointing.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 25*, 130.
Import Duty on Articles for H.M. Forces.
Q. Mr. Holt; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 25*, 129.
Loans Guaranteed by Imperial Government.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 443.
Naval Defence of—Advice given at Conference.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 29*, 461, 462.
Naval Reserves—Progress made with Enrolment.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 30*, 721, 722; Lord Tweedmouth, 728.

Committees
Scottish Grand Committee, Obstruction in.
Os. Mr. Seddon, *July 26*, 270, 271; Sir F. Banbury, 272; Sir H. Craik, 275; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 285; Mr. Lambton, 288.

Companies Bill
Second Reading, Date of taking.
Q. Sir J. Randles; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 5*, 1561.

Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883
Colonies covered by.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 26*, 242.

Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill
l. Com., July 30, 702.
*Rep.** *July 31*, 931.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1183.
c. 1R.* *Aug. 5*, 1563.

Conferment of Honours

Public Services—Setting out in Patents, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Markham; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 31*, 973, 974.

Congested Districts Board (Scotland)

Powers, Extension of, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 29*, 495.

Congo Free State

Annexation by Belgium, Proposals for.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *July 29*, 410, 436; Earl of Mayo, 422; Lord Fitzmaurice, 429; Marquess of Lansdowne, 434; Marquess of Ripon, 435; Sir G. Parker, *Aug. 1*, 1256.

Belgian Administration — Charges of Cruelty to Natives, etc.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *July 29*, 402, 436; Archbishop of Canterbury, 412; Lord Clifford of Chudleigh, 417; Earl of Mayo, 419; Bishop of Southwark, 424; Lord Fitzmaurice, 426, 436; Marquess of Lansdowne, 431; Sir G. Parker, *Aug. 1*, 1253–1258; Mr. McKean, 1266–1280; Mr. H. Law, 1280–1282; Sir E. Grey, 1317.

British Policy and Obligations.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *July 29*, 405, 408; Archbishop of Canterbury, 414; Earl of Mayo, 423; Lord Fitzmaurice, 428; Marquess of Lansdowne, 432; Marquess of Ripon, 435; Sir G. Parker, *Aug. 1*, 1258; Sir C. Dilke, 1262–1266; Sir C. Hill, 1298–1300.

Consular Representation in United Kingdom.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 6*, 1825.

Consolidated Fund

Allowances Paid out of.
Qs. Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 30*, 770, 771.

Grant towards making good Supply, £72,563,714, *Com.* July 31*, 1089; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1345.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill

c. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 1345.

Consols

Decline in—Losses of Savings Bank Depositors, etc.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 6*, 1828, 1829.

Government Purchases—Monthly Publications of Amount, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hyde; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug.* 5, 1521, 1522.

Constabulary, Royal Irish

[*See also names of Places.*]

Cruise, District Inspector, Complaints against.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1553, 1554.

Duties as to Farms from which Cattle have been Driven.
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 966.

Increase, proposals for.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1551, 1552.

Inspectors, System of Appointing.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 459.

McGovern, T., Case of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 939.

Vote for, *July 31*, 1062; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

Consular Service

See Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Cookstown

Railway Rates on Goods.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 25*, 116.

Coolcuslough Mountain

Outrage of 21st inst., Cause of.
Qs. Capt. Craig, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 969.

Cooper, Dr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]

Carshalton Hospital, Annual Cost of, *Aug. 1*, 1197.

"Exmouth" Annual Inspection — Payment of Luncheons of Visitors, *Aug. 1*, 1214.

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con., Aug. 6*, 1951–1954, 1962, 1964, 1967.

Parliamentary Elections—Second Ballot System, *July 29*, 441; *Aug. 1*, 1210.

Poor Law—Shirley Schools, Expenditure on, *Aug. 6*, 1832.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1441.

Cooper Estate

Sale of—Cases of J. McGrath and T. Barry.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1840, 1841.

Corbett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]

Factory and Workshop Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 2000.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]

Chief Secretary, Policy of, *July 25*, 229.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 29*, 503, 506, 536, 537, 554, 567, 570.

Factory and Workshop Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1998–2000.

Cork
Queen's College—Report (1906-7), Presented, *Aug. 1*, 1185.

Corn
Tax on.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, *July 30*, 789, 790; Mr. Byles, 790, 798.

Cornwall, Duchy of
Lord Warden—Earl of Ducie.

Cornwall, Sir E. A. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Com.*, *July 26*, 311, 313, 356.

Cory, Mr. C. J. [Cornwall, St. Ives]
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Deduction for Propelling Power Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1349-1354, 1372.

Costa Rica
Trade Report Presented, *July 29*, 383.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1681.
India
Bengal—Mymensingh Riots, Cause of, *July 30*, 756.
Executive and Judicial Functions, Separation of, *July 30*, 755, 756.
Flogging as Judicial Punishment, *July 25*, 119.
Opium
Chinese Import Restrictions, *July 30*, 764.
Cultivation in India, *July 30*, 755.
Indian Prices in 1907, *July 25*, 119.
International Conference — Chinese Attitude, *July 30*, 767.
Transvaal British Indians, Position of, *Aug. 5*, 1534.

Council of India Bill
c. 1R.* *July 25*, 157.
2R., *Aug. 5*, 1673.
Com., *Aug. 6*, 1968.

County Courts
Ireland—Vote for, *July 31*, 1062; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

Vote for, *July 31*, 1061; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act, 1877
Sum received under.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 138.

Courthorpe, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
Army
Ammunition—Copper-pressure Gauges used in Testing, *July 30*, 751.
Bullet Velocities, *July 30*, 751.

Courthope, Mr. G. L.—*cont.*
Army—*cont.*
Cartridges — Breech Pressure and Muzzle Velocity, *July 30*, 750, 752.
Shooting Team for the Colonies, Payments to, *July 30*, 749, 750.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1944, 1948.
Questions, Sequence of, *July 30*, 749.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1670.

Courtney, Lord
Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 382.
Bills—Printing to show what Parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 401.
Fatal Accidents (Damages) Bill, Intro., *July 30*, 737; 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1690-1692, 1695.

Coventry Corporation Bill
c. 3R.* *July 25*, 106.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con. July 31*, 925.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Cowan, Mr. W. H. [Surrey, Guildford]
Voters' Lists — Payment of Revising Barristers, *Aug. 5*, 1520.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
Colonies — Work of British Commercial Agents, *July 29*, 484, 485.
Consuls, Commercial Work of, *July 29*, 482, 483, 484.
India
Bengal Police Action for Libel, *Aug. 6*, 1823.
Bombay — Prosecution for Salt gathered on Shore, *July 29*, 443.
Land Values (Scotland) Bill—Reply to Deputation of 28th ult., *July 25*, 151.
Post Office Mail Service Route to Shanghai and Hong Kong, *Aug. 2*, 1377-1379.
Shirley Schools, Expenditure on, Aug. 6, 1832.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Effect on Existing Contracts, *Aug.* 1, 1213.
Tea, Indian—Russian Imports, *July 25*, 118.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 365, 369.
Transvaal Asiatic Law Amendment Act, Administration of, *July 25*, 128.

Craig, Captain J. [Down, E.]
Coolcuslough Mountain—Cause of Outrage on 21st inst., *July 31*, 969.
Militia, Irish, Proposals as to, *July 25*, 126.
Mullaghboy Postman, Attack on, *Aug. 5*, 1560.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
Bann River Drainage, Cost and Method of carrying out, *July 25*, 204, 206.
Belfast—Case of Welsh Children, *July 31*, 968.
Benmore—Assault on T. Corcoran, *July 31*, 969.
Coolcuslough Mountain—Cause of Outrage on 21st inst., *July 31*, 969.
Estimates, Irish—Opportunity for discussing, *July 25*, 202-204.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 501-503, 516-518, 538-541, 555, 563-567. 569.

Craig, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
Committee, Scottish Grand, Obstruction in, *July 26*, 275.
Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1105-1109.
Education (Scotland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 26*, 275, 276.
School Building Grant, Proposals for, *July 25*, 143; *July* 29, 490, 491.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1864, 1865, 1905-1909.
Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1619.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendments, *July 30*, 905-908.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
Navy Expenditure, *July 31*, 1042, 1044.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord President of the Council.*
Bills—Printing to show what parts have been passed by means of the closure, proposed, *July 29*, 396, 402.
Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 25*, 106.
Elementary Schools, Provision of—Allocation of Grant of £100,000, *July 25*, 44-46.
Evicted Tenants—Terms of Re-instatement on Ponsonby, Luggacurran and Coolgreaney Estates, *July 30*, 732.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1696-1706, 1774.
Secondary School Regulations—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 51-53.
Training Colleges
Hostels, Decision as to, *July 25*, 50.
New Regulations—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 47-51.
Trust Deeds, Responsibility for carrying out, *July 25*, 46.

Criminal Appeal Bill
c. Con., *July 29*, 587.
3R., *July 29*, 693.
l. 1R.* *July 30*, 702.
2R., *Aug. 5*, 1471.

Criminal Appeal Bill—*cont.*
Debates on Consideration [Commons], *July 29*, 587, and Second Reading (Lords), *Aug. 5*, 1471.
Adjournment of Debate, proposed, 639-644, 659-662, 683-686.
Applications for Leave to Appeal, 607-610.
Capital Sentences, Appeal granted in all cases of, 1472.
Court, Constitution of, 1472.
Establishment of Court of Appeal, 617-630.
Expense of Unsuccessful Appeals, Proposals for Meeting, 687.
Extension of Time for Application for Leave to Appeal, 678.
Government Amendments, 691.
Home Office Decisions, Public Dissatisfaction with, 1472, 1473, 1477, 1478, 1480.
Home Secretary to decide as to *primâ facie* Evidence, 613-630.
Increase of Sentence, Prohibiting, 663-676.
New Trial
No Witnesses to be heard at, 1475.
Power of Court to Order, 645-658, 1472, 1474.
Persons under Sentence of Death—Right of Appeal, 631-633.
Points of Law, Appeal on, 587-606.
Questions of Fact, Appeal on, 633-639
Responsibilites of Juries, Objections to interfering with, 1475, 1478, 1482, 1484.
Right of Appellant to be Present, 680-682.

Criminal Procedure
Death Sentences (1906-7).
Q. Mr. Rawlinson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 2*, 1380.

Cromer, Lord
Grant to.
Os. Earl of Crewe, *July 25*, 106; Marquess of Ripon, *July 30*, 697-700; Marquess of Lansdowne, 700-702; Mr. Grayson, 873-875; Sir E. Grey, 875-883; Mr. J. Robertson, 883-886; Mr. Rees, *Aug. 1*, 1301.
Resolution Reported, *Aug. 1*, 1342.
Resolution passed by the Lords prior to Discussion in the Commons—Alleged Breach of Privilege.
Os. Mr. Markham, Mr. S. MacNeill, Mr. Speaker, *July 31*, 977, 978.

[*cont.*

Cromer, Lord—*cont.*

Grant to—*cont.*

Tributes to Administration of Egypt.

Qs. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 30*, 835–839 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 839–841 ; Mr. W. Redmond, 858–867; Mr. H. Beaumont, 866 ; Mr. Kettle, 867–873.

Pension of.

Q. Mr. Kettle ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 131, 132.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]

Belfast

Constabulary Dispute, *Aug. 6*, 1847, 1848.

Dock Strike, *Aug. 6*, 1848.

Eltham Common—Decision as to War Office Works, *Aug. 1*, 1207.

Imperial Service Medal—Conditions of granting, *Aug. 1*, 1203.

War Office Marquee Contracts, *July 29*, 447.

Woolwich Arsenal

Discharges

Bonus—Payment of, *July 31*, 948.

Discussion, Opportunity for, *Aug. 1*, 1231, 1232.

Minimum Establishment, *July 25*, 123, 125.

Croydon

Vaccination Case—Cause of Death of Boy.

Qs. Mr. Lupton ; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 773, 774.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]

Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 358.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 518.

Curran, Mr. P. [Durham, Jarrow]

Belfast Dock Strike—Present Position, *Aug. 1*, 1227 ; *Aug. 6*, 1847.

Customs Statistical Office Clerks, Memorial from, *July 25*, 138.

Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 797, 812-814.

Income Tax, Graduation of, *July 30*, 814.

Land Values, Taxation of, proposed, *July 30*, 814.

Customs and Excise

Appointments, Promotion and Retirements in Customs Department.

Qs. Mr. C. Duncan ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 134–137.

Collectors, Appointments of.

Q. Mr. C. Duncan ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug.* 5, 1544.

Customs and Excise—*cont.*

Jerquer, Duties of.

Qs. Mr. Rees ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 136, 137.

Q. Mr. C. Duncan ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug.* 5, 1543.

Statistical Office Clerks, Memorial from.

Q. Mr. Curran ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 138.

Surveyors—Promotion System.

Q. Mr. C. Duncan ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug 5*, 1544.

Upper Section Clerks, Vacancies for.

Q. Mr. C. Duncan ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 5*, 1543.

Cyprus

Grant-in-Aid, Vote for, *July 31*, 1071 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1238.

"Daily Graphic"

Picture Published on 20th inst.

Qs. Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. J. Redmond, Capt. Donelan ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 149–151.

Qs. Mr. Herbert, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Flynn, Sir H. Vincent ; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 30*, 779, 780.

Dairy Industry

Ireland, Encouragement of Winter Dairying in.

Qs. Mr. Hayden, *July 25*, 177.

State Control of, Legislation to Effect, proposed.

Qs. Lord Kenyon, *July 25*, 12–14 ; Lord Allendale, 14–16 ; Earl of Onslow, 16.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]

Navy—"Ariel," Loss of, etc., *July 29*, 461.

Darfield

School Accommodation.

Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox, Mr. Clough ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 29*, 490.

D'Averquerque, Lord

Pension of.

Q. Mr. Lea ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug.* 6, 1844.

Davies, Mr. E. W. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]

Carnarvon—Estates Duties Paid (1901–6), *July 31*, 944.

Mines Inquiry—Constitution of Commission, *Aug. 6*, 1831.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]

Beer-Hawking in London, *July 31*, 953.

Indian Factories, Child Labour in, *July 30*, 758.

Motor Omnibus Accidents, Prevention of, *July 31*, 954.

Davies, Mr. W. H. [Bristol, S.]

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1363, 1364.

Deaths
- Certain Occupations, Mortality from—Proposals as to Report.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 773.
- Ireland—Report (1906) Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1470, 1514.
- Scotland—Report Presented, *July 29*, 384, 439.
- Tuberculous Foods, Deaths Caused by.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 745.

Deel River
- Askeaton Weir—Inquiry proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 31*, 963, 964.

Defence of the Empire
- Home Defence—Duty of the Navy.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 29*, 460.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
- Abbeyleix—Cause of Injury to Filly, *July 31*, 967.
- Ballyquaide Glebe—Repayments toward Capital, *Aug. 1*, 1200.
- Bogtown—Case of Mrs. M. Connor, *July 30*, 781.
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 309.
- Caldbeck Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 5*, 1529.
- Edwards Estate—Case of P. Dempsey, *Aug. 6*, 1837.
- Maryborough—Case of T. L. Hodgins, *July 31*, 966.
- Roe Estate, Sale of, *July 30*, 781.
- Roskeen—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Delany, *Aug. 5*, 1528.
- Warrenford Estate, Owner of, *Aug. 1*, 1200.
- Works Board Accountant, Appointment of, *July 30*, 784.

Delmege Estate
- Untenanted Land, Purchase of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1842.

Denbigh, Earl of
- Sugar—Brussels Convention, *Aug. 5*, 1489-1498, 1501.

Denman, Lord
- Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 380, 383; *Aug. 1*, 1138-1144.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1764-1770.
- Lights on Vehicles Bill, *Com.*, *July 30*, 713.
- Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 927; 3R., *Aug. 5*, 1488.

Development Grant, Ireland
- Vote for, *July 31*, 1080; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Belfast, W.]
- Belfast
  - Constabulary Grievances, *July 25*, 149, 207.
  - Dock Strike, Measures taken to cope with, *July 25*, 207, 208.
  - Health Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *Aug. 5*, 1523.
  - Tramway Contract, Allocation of, *July 25*, 121.
- Post Office, Favouritism in, *July 26*, 241.
- Provincial Bank of Ireland, Government Business transacted by, *Aug. 5*, 1523.

Devonport Corporation Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Devonshire
- Charities — Return Presented, *Aug. 1*, 1185.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh, S.]
- Ordnance Survey—Case of Mr. J. Gardner, *Aug. 1*, 1219, 1220.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1883-1886.

Dewar, Sir J. A. [Inverness]
- Ben Nevis Observatories, Grant for, *Aug. 1*, 1213.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1865, 1903-1905.
  - Report Stage, Date of taking, *Aug. 1*, 1230.

Dilke, Sir C. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
- Army—Territorial Force Cavalry Training, etc., *July 29*, 464.
- Business, Method of Conducting, *July 26*, 261, 262.
- Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883, Colonies covered by, *July 26*, 242.
- Congo—British Policy and Obligations, *Aug. 1*, 1262-1266.
- Egypt, British Occupation of, *Aug. 1*, 1258, 1259.
- Explosives, Prohibition of Use of, by Airships, *July 30*, 764.
- Hague Conference—Arbitration *v.* War, Progress made with Negotiations, *Aug. 1*, 1260-1262.
- Macedonia, European Policy as to, *Aug. 1*, 1259.
- Navy
  - Battleships
    - Construction Programme, *July 31*, 997-1001.
    - Return, Classification of Ships in, *July 31*, 999, 1000.
  - Cruisers, Construction Programme, *July 31*, 1003.
  - Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy as to, *July 31*, 1002.

[*cont.*

Dilke, Sir C.—*cont.*
Russia — Anglo - Russian Negotiations, *Aug. 1*, 1262.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendts., *July 30*, 889-893, 895, 896, 916, 918.

Diplomatic and Consular Service
Attachés, Working of System
Qs. Mr. S. Roberts, *Aug. 1*, 1295.
Commercial Work of Consuls—Inquiry.
Qs. Mr. H. Cox ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 482, 483.
Q. Mr. H. Cox ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 484.
Pension System.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 6*, 1827.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1071 ; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

Disorderly Houses
Girls over Fourteen, Removal of
Q. Mr. A. Allen ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 5*, 1515, 1516.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Donelan, Capt. [Cork, E.]
Admiralty—Reply to Queenstown Deputation, *Aug. 1*, 1205.
Daily Graphic—Picture Published on 20 inst., *July 25*, 150.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 378, 382 ; *Aug. 1*, 1139.
Evicted Tenants—Terms of Reinstatement on Ponsonby, Luggacurran and Coolgreaney Estates, *July 30*, 732.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1767, 1768, 1782-1792, 1803.
Lights on Vehicles Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 4-6, *Com.*, *July 30*, 705, 706, 709, 712, 713.

Douglas, Right Hon. A. A. [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Business of the House, Course of, *Aug. 1*, 1232.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 587, 666 ; 3R., 692.
Employment of Women Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1465.
Factory and Workshop Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1995-1997.
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 373.
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill—Expenses Resolution, *Aug. 6*, 1989.

Douglas Estate
Untenanted Land, Sale of
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 6*, 1815.

Dromulton
Reinstatement Claim of Mr. T. Brosnan.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1522.

Drumraney
Untenanted Land, Purchase of
Q. Sir W. Nugent ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug.* 2, 1382.

Dublin
School of Art—Vacancy in Headmastership.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 163.
Technical School—Dispute between Agriculture Board and City Corporation.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 163, 164.
Veterinary College, Grants to.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 163.

Duckworth, Mr. J. [Stockport]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 16*, 330-334.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
Clanmorris Estate, Purchase of, *Aug. 1*, 1191.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 522.
Kinvara Crops, Condition of, *July* 29, 444.

Duke of York's School
Changes, proposed in.
Q. Sir. W. J. Collins ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 31*, 948, 949.

Dumbarton Burgh and County Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
l. 1R.* *Aug. 5*, 1470.

Dumbarton Burgh Order Confirmation Bill
l. 1R., 2R., *Com. and Rep.** *Aug. 6*, 1689.

Duncan, Mr. C. [Barrow-in-Furness]
Customs Department
Appointment, &c., *July 25*, 134, 137.
Collectors, Appointment of, *Aug. 5*, 1544.
Jerquers, Information as to, *Aug. 5*, 1543.
Surveyors—Promotion System, *Aug. 5*, 1544.
Upper Section Clerks, Vacancies for, *Aug. 5*, 1543.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanark, Govan]
Anticipatory Motions Committee, Recommendations, *July 29*, 499.
Indian Rupee, Circulation of, *July 25*, 127.

Dundee Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum
Vote for, *July 31*, 1062 ; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

Dungimmon
Police Attendance at Meeting on 28th ult.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5,* 1554, 1555.

Dunraven, Earl
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug 6,* 1728–1742.

Dunraven Estate
Case of J. Micks.
Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug 1,* 1222, 1223.

Edalji Case
Further Inquiry, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. F. E. Smith ; A. Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 1,* 1189, 1190.

Edinburgh
Register House, Vote for, *July 31,* 1061 ; *Aug. 1,* 1236.

Education, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. T. Lough.
Medical Department, Cost of.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25,* 141.
Statistics, Form of Presenting.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich ; A. Mr. Lough, *Aug. 6,* 1836.
Vote for, *July 31,* 1065 ; *Aug. 1,* 1237.

Education (England and Wales)
[*For* particular Places, *see their names.*]
Elementary Schools, Provision of—Allocation of Grant of £100,000, Legal and Constitutional Aspect of the Matter.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 25,* 17–20 ; Earl of Crewe, 44–46; Lord Loreburn, 57–59 ; Lord Ashbourne, 59, 60 ; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 60, 61 ; Marquess of Salisbury, 84 ; Lord Fitzmaurice, 95–97.
Endowed Schools, Masters of—Case of Wright *v.* Zetland and others.
Qs. Mr. Mallet ; *As.* Mr. Lough, *Aug 1,* 1218.
London Schools, Income of.
Q. Dr. Rutherford ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 6,* 1813.
Passive Resisters, Prosecutions of.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 5,* 1537, 1538.
School Hygiene Congress, Invitations to.
Q. Dr. Rutherford ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25,* 140.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *Aug.* 6, 1835, 1836.
Schools in Wales, etc.—List Presented, *July 25,* 3, 109.

Education (England and Wales)—*cont.*
Secondary Schools
Regulations, New—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 25,* 17, 20–26 ; Earl of Crewe, 51–53 ; Duke of Norfolk, 57 ; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 62 ; Lord Herries, 74–76 ; Bishop of Salisbury, 82 ; Marquess of Salisbury, 85, 86 ; Lord Fitzmaurice, 98–100.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *Aug.* 6, 1834.
Trust Endowments—Responsibility of the Board of Education.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 25,* 25 ; Marquess of Salisbury, 87, 88.
Teachers, Superannuation of.
Q. Mr. Jowett ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25,* 141, 142.
Wales—Regulations Presented, *July 29,* 383, 439.
Special Grant of £100,000, Conditions of Giving.
Q. Sir H. Craik ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 25,* 143, 144.
Qs. Sir H. Craik, Mr. A. J. Balfour ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *July 29,* 490, 491.
Regulations, Issue of.
Qs. Mr. Gretton, Sir P. Magnus ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 30,* 776, 777.
Training Colleges
Candidates, Regulations as to Interviewing.
Qs. Mr. Butcher, Lord R. Cecil ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 31,* 957, 958.
Church of England — Expenditure since 1895.
Q. Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 5,* 1542.
Hostels, Decision as to.
Os. Archbishop of Canterbury, *July 25,* 32 ; Earl of Crewe, 50 ; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 66 ; Bishop of St. Albans, 72, 73 ; Lord Fitzmaurice, 103, 104.
New Regulations for—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *July 25,* 17, 26–28 ; Archbishop of Canterbury, 29–44 ; Earl of Crewe, 47–51 ; Duke of Norfolk, 53–57, 105 ; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 62–67 ; Bishop of St. Albans, 67–74 ; Bishop of Southwark, 77–82 ; Marquess of Salisbury, 88–93 ; Lord Fitzmaurice, 100–106.

Education (England and Wales)—*cont.*
Training Colleges—*cont.*
Trust Deeds, Responsibility for Carrying out.
Os. Archbishop of Canterbury, *July 25*, 42; Earl of Crewe, 46; Bishop of St. Albans, 70.
Votes for, *July 31*, 1066; *Aug. 1*, 1237.
Comparison with Scotland and Ireland.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 445.

Education (Ireland)
[*For* particular places, *see their names.*]
Amalgamation of Schools, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1515.
Commissioners, Power to Demand Resignation of.
Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 967, 968.
Duplicate Records, Cost of Preparing.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 30*, 743, 744.
Gaelic League, Work of.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 31*, 973.
Gardening, Instruction in.
Q. Mr. John O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 147.
Inspectors
Grievances, Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1548, 1549.
Junior, System of Appointing.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1523.
System of Appointing.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 458.
National School Teachers
Awards to.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1202, 1203.
Civil Rights, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 26*, 243; *July 30*, 783, 784.
Insurance under Workmen's Compensation Act.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31*, 971, 972.
Junior Assistants, Work of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 938.
Pensions Awarded.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 6*, 1808.
Promotion System.
Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1529.
Salaries, Period for Paying.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 447.

Education (Ireland)—*cont.*
Schools with Average Attendance below Fifty, Assistant Mistresses for.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 2*, 1382.
Small Schools in Rural Districts, Need for.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 5*, 1557.
Votes for, *July 31*, 1067; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

Education, Scotland
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
[*For* particular places, *see their names.*]
Drawing, Memorandum as to Teaching, Presented, *Aug. 2*, 1376; *Aug. 5*, 1470.
Grants—Amount in 1906–7.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 25*, 111, 112.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1066; *Aug. 1*, 1257.

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill
c. 2R., *July 31*, 1097.
Report from Standing Committee, *Aug. 6*, 1849.

Education Act (Amendment) Bill
Proposals as to.
Os. Sir F. Powell, *July 26*, 274.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill
c. *Rep.* July 30*, 738.
3R.* *July 31*, 932.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Education (Provision of Meals) Act
Application of.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25*, 143.

Education (Scotland) Bill
Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Gulland, *July 26*, 275; Sir H. Craik, 275, 276.

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill
c. 2R., *July 29*, 695.

Edwards Estate
Case of Mr. P. Dempsey.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1837.

Egypt
  Army of Occupation, Sum voted for.
    Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 6*, 1826.
  British Occupation of.
    Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 1*, 1258, 1259.
  British Officers, Attack on — Punitive Operations against Denshawi Village.
    Os. Mr. W. Redmond, *July 30*, 863–866 ; Mr. Kettle, 871, 872 ; Sir E. Grey, 878–881 ; Mr. H. Law, *Aug. 1*, 1282–1285 ; Sir E. Grey 1309–1311 ; Mr. S. MacNeill, 1311.
  Buildings collapsing during last Twelve Months.
    Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
  Cairo
    New Barracks, Ownership of.
      Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 6*, 1826.
    Water Supply.
      Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*, 1210, 1211.
  Company Laws.
    Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 6*, 1826, 1827.
  Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *see* Cromer, Lord.
  Education
    Arabic, Teaching of.
      Os. Dr. Rutherford, *Aug. 1*, 1245 ; Sir E. Grey, 1313.
    Grant for European Study.
      Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
    Policy as to.
      Os. Mr. W. Redmond, *July 30*, 863 ; Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*, 1311.
    University, Establishment of, proposed.
      Os. Dr. Rutherford, *Aug. 1*, 1245 ; Sir E. Grey, 1311, 1312.
  Home Rule for, proposed.
    Os. Dr. Rutherford, *Aug. 1*, 1247–1249 ; Sir E. Grey, 1313, 1314.
  Judicial Departments, Organisation of.
    Os. Mr. W. Redmond, *July 30*, 863.
  Khedivial School of Law, Rectorship of.
    Qs. Mr. MacNeill ; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 768.
  Municipal Government, Extension of Principle.
    Qs. Dr. Rutherford, *Aug. 1*, 1246, 1314 ; Sir E. Grey, 1313.
  Public Libraries, Provision of.
    Os. Dr. Rutherford, *Aug. 1*, 1246.
  Special Tribunal, Proposals as to.
    Qs. Mr. MacNeill ; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 767, 768.
  Trade Report Presented, *July 25*, 4.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
  c. *Rep.** *July 25*, 107.
    *Con.** *July 26*, 239.
    3R.* *July 29*, 438.
  l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 1*, 1138.
    Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Electric Supply Corporation Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Eleven o'Clock Rule
  Suspension of
    Motion [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *July 31*, 978.

Elgin and Kincardine, Earl of—*Secretary of State for the Colonies*
  Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R *Aug. 1*, 1151.
  Sugar—Brussels Convention, *Aug.* 5, 1501–1503.

Ellenborough, Lord
  Australia, Naval Vessels for, proposed, *July 30*, 730, 731.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
  Saville's Crossing Fatality, *July 30*, 744.

Eltham Common
  War Office Works, Decision as to.
    Qs. Mr. Crooks, Lord Balcarres ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 1*, 1207.

Employment of Women Bill
  c. 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1465.
    *Com.** *Rep.** and 3R.* *Aug. 6*, 1991.

Erasmus Smith Property
  Sale of—Cases of J. Harty, T. Burke and J. Ryan.
    Q. Mr. Lundon ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1841.

Esher, Viscount
  Lights on Vehicles Bill, *Com.*, *July 30*, 710.
  Official Communications, Steps taken to secure Secrecy of, *July 30*, 716–719.

Estimates
[*See also titles* Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, *and* Navy Estimates.]
Irish, Opportunity for discussing.
Os. Mr. C. Craig, *July 25*, 202-204.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorganshire, Mid.]
Bills—Carrying over from one Session to another, proposed, *July 26*, 266.
Business, Method of conducting, *July 26*, 266.
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 340, 357.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 607-609, 626.
Session, Duration of, *July 26*, 266.

Everett, Mr. R. L. [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 803-806.
Financial Position of the Country, *July 30*, 803, 804.
Old-age Pensions, Government Policy as to, *July 30*, 804.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1861.
Sugar Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *July 30*, 803.

Eversley, Lord
Evicted Tenants—Terms of Reinstatement on Ponsonby, Luggacurran and Coolgreaney Estates, *July 30*, 731.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill
c. Con., *July 29*, 501.
3R., *Aug. 2*, 1385.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 2*, 1374.
2R., *Aug. 6*, 1696.
Clause 12, Effect of—Ballymena Rural Council Resolution.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1223.
Debates on Consideration [Commons], *July 29*, 501; Third Reading, *Aug. 2*, 1385; Second Reading [Lords] *Aug. 6*, 1696.
Appeal against Decisions, Omission of, Provision for, 1406, 1423, 1428, 1435, 1436, 1701, 1724, 1725, 1771, 1772, 1781, 1794, 1796, 1797.
Clause 1, Omission of, proposed, 563-574.
Cost of carrying out, 1425, 1430.
Debts contracted prior to Purchase, Non-liability of Reinstated Tenant for, 551-555, 1389, 1703, 1726.
Definition of Class of Persons to be reinstated, 1748, 1749, 1776, 1778.
Government Amendments, 578, 579, 583, 587.
Grass Lands, Valuation of, 502, 1727, 1786, 1787.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
Debates on Consideration—cont.
Land
Acquisition of, subject to an Annuity by Agreement, proposed, 513-528, 1419, 1420.
Amount required, 503.
Compensation to Expropriated Owners, 1740.
Compulsory Acquisition Objections to, 563-574, 1388, 1392-1394, 1399, 1406, 1410, 1422, 1698, 1715, 1722-1724, 1729-1732, 1742-1744, 1750, 1754, 1759, 1762, 1763, 1773, 1786, 1787-1790, 1793, 1795.
Definition of Class of Land to be acquired, 1738-1740.
Losses on Re-sale, Method of defraying, 1703, 1716, 1735-1738, 1747, 1767, 1775.
Land Clauses Act of 1845—Incorporation of Sections 15-68 in the Measure, proposed, 529-544, 1435.
New Tenants or "Planters"
Choice of Farms to be offered to, 1437.
Position of, 1389, 1390, 1393, 1397, 1402, 1403, 1406, 1407, 1412, 1415, 1416, 1422, 1436, 1701, 1710-1713, 1735, 1745, 1755, 1756, 1760, 1763, 1767, 1768, 1774, 1797.
Number of Persons to be reinstated, 501, 505, 1391, 1434, 1708, 1747, 1766.
Limiting to 2,000, proposed, 555-560, 1407, 1704, 1773, 1779.
Occupying Owners, Position of, 1424, 1425.
Price per Acre to be paid for Farms acquired compulsorily, 502, 507, 1417, 1418, 1432, 1700, 1725, 1726, 1733, 1734, 1744, 1789, 1790.
Recommittal to Select Committee proposed, 501-511.
Rejection of Bill, proposed, 1385-1398.
Sporting Rights on Land compulsorily acquired to remain with the Vendor if he so desire, proposed, 547-551.
Status of Estates Commissioners, Alteration in, 1425, 1426, 1430, 1431, 1703, 1727, 1728, 1746, 1774, 1775, 1780, 1799.
Tribunal for carrying out—Objections to Land Commissioners, 1715, 1732, 1733, 1756, 1757, 1759, 1769, 1772, 1779, 1780, 1790, 1794, 1799.
Money, Method of raising.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 5*, 1561, 1562.

Evictions
See under Ireland.

Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill
- *c. Con., July 31*, 1126.
  - 3R.* *July 31*, 1129.
- *l.* 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 1157.

Exchequer and Audit Department
- Abstractors, Promotion of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 6*, 1811, 1812.
- Assistant Comptroller and Auditor, Duties of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 30*, 744.
- Colonial Audit Branch
  - Clerks, Salaries, etc., of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug 6*, 1810, 1811.
  - Colonial Contributions to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 1194.
- Examiners, Leave and Annual Allowances of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 1193, 1194.
- Luncheon Regulations of Staff, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 1193, 1194.
- Officers of Old Examiner Class, Cases of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 6*, 1810, 1812.
- Staff, Payment of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31*, 940.

Exeter
- Income-Tax Distraints—Case of Mr. H. Hems.
  - *Qs.* Sir G. Kekewich, Mr. C. E. Price; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 6*, 1830, 1831.

"Exmouth"
- Annual Inspection—Payment of Luncheons, etc., of Visitors.
  - *Q.* Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 1*, 1214.

Explosives
- Airships, Prohibition of use by.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 764, 765.
- Rayleigh Cordite Committee—Date of presenting Report.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Bellairs, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 463.

Exports and Imports
- Colonial Goods, Import Duties on.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 955.
- Statistics for United Kingdom and Foreign Countries.
  - *Os.* Sir G. Parker, *July 30*, 795–798.
  - *Qs.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Aug. 1*, 1185.
  - Return ordered, *July 31*, 934.

Faber, Captain W. V. [Hants, Andover]
- Army
  - Scots Greys, Accommodation for, *July 30*, 754.
  - Territorial Force—County Association Secretaryships, *July 30*, 752, 753.
- Tidworth Barracks—Cost of Mooltan Block, *July 30*, 752.
- Friendly Societies—Liability for Officials under Workmen's Compensation Act, *July 30*, 771.
- Hague Conference
  - Limitation of Armaments—Terms of Resolution, *Aug. 1*, 1211.
  - Proceedings, Tabling of, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
- Piccadilly Motor Omnibus Traffic, *July 30*, 771, 772.
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Discussion on, *Aug. 1*, 1207.

Factory and Workshops Bill
- *c.* 2R. *Aug. 6*, 1991.
- *Debate on Second Reading* [Commons, *Aug. 6*, 1991.
  - Ireland, Extension to, 1996.
  - Laundries
    - Bringing within the Scope of Act of 1901, 1992.
    - Clause in Act of 1905, Unsatisfactory working of, 1992, 1993.
    - Hours of Labour, Allocation of, 1997.
    - Inspection, Provisions for, 1993, 1996, 1998, 1999.
    - Reformatory Institutions, Provisions as to, 1995.
- Explanatory Statement ordered and Presented, *Aug. 6*, 1849.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
- Army—Case of J. M. Dunleany, *July 25*, 121.
- Ballywillan—Case of J. Finnegan, *July 25*, 148.
- Granard Postal Facilities, *July 25*, 151.
- Kilbride—Case of Miss A. Connor, *July 25*, 148.

Fatal Accidents (Damages) Bill
- *l.* Intro. and 1R., *July 30*, 737.
  - 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1690.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
- Bills involving Financial Considerations, Postponement of, *Aug. 5*, 1562.
- Colonial Loans guaranteed by Imperial Government, *July 29*, 443.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Method of raising Money, *Aug. 5*, 1561.
- Sugar Beet Cultivation, *July 31*, 956.
- Transvaal, Loan of £5,000,000—Contents of Transvaal Bill, *July 29*, 475.

[*cont.*

Fell, Mr. A.—*cont.*
- Uganda Railway Annuities, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
- Unemployed
  - Grant, Proposals as to, *July 31*, 956.
  - Work provided for, *July 31*, 956.
- Whitefield—Case of Ranelagh Foundation, *July 31*, 958.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1863, 1882-1884.
  - Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1579-1582.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G. [Fermanagh, N.]
- Bar of Slattenagh Postal Facilities, *Aug. 1*, 1194.
- Bloomfield Estate—Disposal of Castlecaldwell Lands, *Aug. 2*, 1381.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 533-535.
- Land Purchase Annuities — Payment in Stock, *Aug. 6*, 1842.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
- Labourers' Acts Loans, Capital, Duty on, *Aug. 5*, 1557.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Audit of Irish Government Accounts, *July 30*, 743; *July 31*, 940, 941.
- Constabulary Inspector, System of Appointing, *July 29*, 459.
- Deaths caused by Tuberculous Foods, *July 30*, 745.
- Education
  - Duplicate Records, Cost of Preparing, *July 30*, 743.
  - Inspectors, System of Appointing, *July 29*, 458.
- Exchequer and Audit Department
  - Abstractors, Promotion of, *Aug. 6*, 1811.
  - Assistant Comptroller, Duties of, *July 30*, 744.
  - Colonial Audit Branch
    - Clerks, Salaries, etc., of, *Aug. 6*, 1810.
    - Colonial Contributions, *Aug. 1*, 1194.
  - Examiners, Leave and Annual Allowances of, *Aug. 1*, 1193.
  - Luncheon Regulations of Staff, *Aug. 1*, 1193, 1194.
  - Officers of Old Examiner Class, Cases of, *Aug. 6*, 1810, 1812.
  - Staff, Payment of, *July 31*, 940.
- Land Commission Book-keeping System, *Aug. 5*, 1522.
- Tobacco Trust—Proposals for dealing with, *July 30*, 745.

Field, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Transvaal—Money Outstanding on Old Loan, *July 30*, 743.
- Works Board Staff, System of Appointing, *July 29*, 458.

Finance Bill.
- *c.* 3R., *July 30*, 786.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 31*, 932.

Findlay, Mr. A. [Lanark, N.E.]
- Business, Method of Conducting, *July 26*, 274.

First Commissioner of Works
- *Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt.*

First Lord of the Admiralty
- *Lord Tweedmouth.*

First Lord of the Treasury
- *Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*

Fiscal Policy
- Colonial Preference, *see that title.*
- Free Trade System, Failure of.
  - *Os.* Sir G. Parker, *July 30*, 786-798; Mr. Hunt, 830-832.
- Manufactured Articles, Import Duty on, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harwood-Banner, *July 30*, 818; Mr. Hunt, 829.

Fisheries
- Protection of Fishing Grounds — Additional Gunboats, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. Power, *July 25*, 199, 200.

FitzGerald's Divorce Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

FitzMaurice Lord — *Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs.*
- Congo Free State Administration, *July 29*, 426, 436.
- Education
  - Elementary Schools, Provision of—Allocation of Grant, etc., *July 25*, 95-97.
  - Secondary School Regulations — Reason for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 98-100.
  - Training Colleges
    - Hostels, Decision as to, *July 25*, 103, 104.
    - New Regulations — Reason for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 100-106.
- Sugar—Brussels Convention, *Aug 5*, 1510-1512.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 348, 350.
- Criminal Appeal Bill, 3R., *July 29*. 692.

[*cont.*

Flavin, Mr. M. J.—*cont.*
Douglas Estate Untenanted Land, Sale of, *Aug. 6*, 1815.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 522, 557.
Lisiniska Constabulary Post—Cases of Coughlin and Kilcawley, *Aug. 5*, 1524.
Magistrates appointed since 1906, *July 25*, 152.
National School Teachers — Promotion System, *Aug 5*, 1529.
Tarbert, Railway Extension to, *Aug. 6*, 1815.

Florists
Factory Act, Application of.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 29*, 483, 484.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 298, 306.
Constabulary
Arms of, *Aug 5*, 1556.
Cruise, District Inspector, Complaints against, *Aug. 5*, 1553, 1554.
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act 1877, sums received under, *July 25*, 138.
Daily Graphic, Pictures of 26th inst, *July 30*, 780.
Meelin—Police Protection of Mr. O. Daly, *July 31*, 964.
Poor Law—Deportation of Irish Paupers, *July 30*, 781.
Saturday Sittings, Proposals for, *July 25*, 152.

Food and Drink
Revenue from, *see under* Revenue and Expenditure.
Taxation of Food
Os. Mr. Harwood-Banner, *July 30*, 818; Mr. Asquith, 819.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State. — Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary.—Lord Fitzmaurice.
Examinations—Exclusion of Geography.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 29*, 449.
Vote for, *July 31*, 105, *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Foreshores
Sales, &c.—Return Ordered, *July 25*, 109, presented *July 26*, 240.

Forster, Mr. H. W. [Kent, Sevenoaks]
Australian States Constitution Bill, *Com.*, *July 31*, 1131.

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derby, Ilkeston]
Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug.* 2, 1452.

Friendly Societies
Deficiencies, Vote for, *July 31*, 1076; *Aug. 1*, 1238.
Liability for Officials under Workmen's Compensation Act.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 771.
Registry, Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

France
Naval Stations in the Mediterranean.
Qs. Sir B. Sheffield; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 1*, 1191, 1206.
Trade Report Presented, *July 25*, 4.

Galway
Condition of—Police Reports.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1552.
Queen's College (1906–7) Presented, *July 29*, 384, 439.

Gardner, Col. A. [Herefordshire, Ross.]
Light Railways Act, Continuance of, *July 29*, 486.

Gardner, Mr. E. [Berkshire, Wokingham.]
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Cost of Administration, *July 30*, 745.
Whitefield—Case of Ranelagh foundation, *July 25*, 142, 143.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 31*, 932.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Gateshead
Motor-driving Prosecution, Procedure in.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 5*, 1538.

Germany
Naval Expenditure.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 6*, 1816.

Gibraltar
Report (1906) Presented *July 25*, 3, 108.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork Co., W.]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July* 26, 348.

Gill, Mr. A. H. [Bolton.]
Factory and Workshop Bill, 2R,, *Aug.* 6, 1997.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J. — *Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
Aliens—Deportations made, *Aug. 5*, 1518.
Belfast Outworkers, Regulations as to, *July 25*, 116.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
- Blind Persons
  - Government Assistance to, *Aug. 6*, 1814.
  - Number in County of London, *Aug. 1*, 1198.
- Broadmoor Asylum — Case of Florence Doughty, *Aug. 1*, 1214.
- Chester-le-Street Vacination Exemption Cases, *July 25*, 139.
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *con.*, *July 29*, 622, 623, 685; 3R., 692.
- Criminal Procedure — Death Sentences (1906-7) *Aug. 2*, 1380.
- Disorderly Houses—Removal of Girls over Fourteen, *Aug. 5*, 1516.
- Edalji Case—Further Inquiry, *Aug. 1*, 1190.
- Education Rates—Prosecutions of Passive Resisters, *Aug. 5*, 1538.
- Factory and Workshops Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1991–1995.
- Florists, Application of Factory Act to, *July 29*, 483, 484.
- Friendly Societies—Liability for Officials under Workmen's Compensation Act, *July 30*, 771.
- Gateshead Motor-driving Prosecution *Aug. 6*, 1538.
- Home Office Contracts, Alterations in, *July 31*, 934.
- Imperial Service Medal, Conditions of granting, *Aug. 1*, 1204.
- Juvenile Offenders — Detention while awaiting Trial, *Aug. 1*, 1198.
- Mines, etc., Inquiry—Constitution of Commission, *Aug. 6*, 1831.
- Motors
  - Noise and Smell from, *Aug. 1*, 1199,
  - Omnibus Accidents, Prevention of, *July 31*, 954.
- Piccadilly Motor Omnibus Traffic, *July 30*, 772.
- Police
  - Anti-Russian Demonstration, Action at, *July 30*, 772.
  - Clerkenwell—complaint made by J. T. Barlow, *Aug. 5*, 1537.
- Prisons
  - Drill in, *July 25*, 139.
  - Lads, Treatment of, *July 25*, 140.
- Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill *Con.*, *July 26*, 370, 371, 373, 375.

Glamorganshire
- Non-provided Schools, Estimate for, *Q.* Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25*, 141.

Gold Coast
- Annual Report (1906) Presented, *July 29*, 383, 439.

Gordon, Mr. J. [Londonderry, S.]
- Evicted Tenants, (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1414, 1419.

Government Departments
- [*See also names of Departments as* Post Office, etc.]
- Contracts—Procedure in Cases of Dispute; *Q.* Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July* 29, 450.
- Ireland, *see that title.*

Granard
- Postal Facilities.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Captain Norton, *July 25*, 151.

Granard, Earl of
- Companies (Debentures and Debenture Stock) Bill, *Com.*, *July 30*, 703.
- Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 394.
- Post Office Sites Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 715.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 30*, 714.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]
- Income Tax Relief under New Scheme, *Aug. 5*, 1521.

Grantown on Spey
- Telephone Extension to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. A. Williamson, Major. Anstruther Gray; *As.* Captain Norton, *Aug. 1*, 1217.

Grayson, Mr. U. [Yorks. W. R. Colne Valley]
- Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 30*, 873–875.

Great Central Railway Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill.
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill.
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 29*, 238.

Greenwich Observatory
- London County Council Generating Station—Progress of Negotiations.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Captain Norton, *Aug. 5*, 1530.
- Report Presented, *July 25*, 3; 108.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 657.
- Macedonia — European Policy, *Aug. 1*, 1296–1298.

Gretton, Mr. [Rutland]
- Burwell Farm—Compensation to Outgoing Tenant, *July 31*, 941.
- Education Special Grant—Issue of Regulation, *July 30*, 776.

[*cont.*

Gretton, Mr.—*cont.*
- Navy
  - Devonport Command—Royal Marines utilised during Mobilisation, *Aug. 1*, 1204.
  - Guns, 12-inch, Reserve of, *Aug. 1*, 1205.
  - Home Fleet—Readiness for Mobilisation, *Aug. 1*, 1204.
  - "Renown," Armament of, *July 30*, 747.
  - Torpedo Boat Flotilla, Strength and Condition of, *July 31*, 1046.
- Telegraph (Money) Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 368.
- Walpole House Farm, Rent for, etc., *Aug. 1*, 1220.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
- Africa, West—San Thomé and Principé, Labour in, *July 25*, 130; *July 30*, 741.
- Aland Islands, Russian Occupation of, *July 30*, 765, 766.
- China—Shanghai Opium Houses, Closing of, *July 25*, 115.
- Congo Free State
  - Belgian Administration—Charges of Cruelty to Natives, etc., *Aug 1*, 1317.
  - Consular Representation in United Kingdom, *Aug. 6*, 1825.
- Cromer, Lord
  - Grant to, *July 30*, 875-883.
  - Pension of, *July 25*, 132.
- Diplomatic and Consular Service—Pension System, *Aug. 6*, 1827.
- Egypt
  - Army of Occupation, Sum voted for, *Aug. 6*, 1826.
  - British Officers, Attack on—Punitive Operations against Denshawi Village, *July 30*, 878-881; *Aug. 1*, 1309-1311.
  - Buildings collapsing during last Twelve Months, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
  - Cairo
    - New Barracks, Ownership of, *Aug. 6*, 1826.
    - Water Supply, *Aug. 1*, 1211.
  - Company Laws, *Aug. 6*, 1827.
  - Education
    - Arabic, Teaching of, *Aug. 1*, 1313.
    - Grant for European Study, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
    - Policy as to, *Aug. 1*, 1311.
    - University, Establishment of, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 1311, 1312.
  - Home Rule for, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 1313, 1314.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont*
- Egypt—*cont*
  - Khedival School of Law, Rectorship of, *July 30*, 768.
  - Municipal Government—Extension of Principle, *Aug. 1*, 1313.
  - Special Tribunal, Proposals as to, *July 30*, 767, 768.
- Explosives, Prohibition of use of, by Airships, *July 30*, 765.
- Foreign Office Examinations—Exclusion of Geography, *July 29*, 449.
- Hague Conference
  - Arbitration *v.* War—Progress made with Negotiations, *Aug. 1*, 1315-1317.
  - Limitation of Armaments — Terms of Resolution, *Aug. 1*, 1211, 1212.
  - Proceedings, Tabling of, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
  - Subjects to be Discussed at, *July 25*, 131-133.
- Iceland—Decree as to Autonomy, *Aug. 6*. 1825.
- Macedonia — European Policy, *Aug. 1*, 1318.
- Mackerel — Irish Trade with United States, *July 30*, 767.
- Morocco—Terms demanded for Release of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 25*, 131.
- Newfoundland Fishery Negotiations, Progress made with, *Aug. 1*, 1211; *Aug. 6*, 1828.
- Norway and Sweden—Negotiations for Treaty, *July 30*, 766.
- Opium
  - Chinese Import Restrictions, *July 30*, 764.
  - International Conference — Chinese Attitude, *July 30*, 767.
- Parliamentary Elections—Foreign Regulations, as to Second Ballot, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
- Russia, Terms of Agreement with, *July 30*, 765; *Aug. 1*, 1318, 1319.
- Soudan—Egyptian Troops in, *July 25*, 132.
- Sugar—Brussels Convention
  - Effect of, and Government Decision as to, *Aug. 1*, 1305-1309.
  - Terms of Draft Protocol, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
- Turkey—Freight Rates to Basra, *July 25*, 130.

Ground Game Act.
- Crofters, Application to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *July 31*, 962.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
  Education (Scotland) Proposals as to, *July 26*, 275.
  Small Landholders Scotland Bill—Date of taking Report Stage, *Aug. 1*, 1230.
  Volunteers, Conveyance of, by Scottish Railways, *July 29*, 471.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
  Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, Facilities for, *Aug. 6*, 1843.

Gwynn, Mr. [Galway]
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill *Com.*, *July 29*, 548.
  Radio-Telegraphic Convention, Ratification of, *July 30*, 848–854, 857.
  Tea and Sugar Duty—Irish Contribution, *July 29*, 442.

Hague Conference
  Arbitration *v.* War, Progress made with Negotiations.
    Qs. Mr. King, *Aug. 1*, 1249–1253; Sir C. Dilke, 1260–1262; Sir E. Grey, 1315–1317.
  Explosives in Airships, *see* Explosives.
  Limitation of Armaments — Terms of Resolution.
    Qs. Captain Faber, Lord Balcarres, Mr. Lea: *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*, 1211, 1212.
  Proceedings, Proposals for Tabling.
    Qs. Captain Faber, Major Anstruther-Gray: *As.* Sir E. Gray, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
  Subjects to be Discussed at—Instructions to British Delegates, etc.
    Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 131.
    Qs. Mr. Mallet, Mr. Bellairs: *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 132, 133.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—[*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
  Aerial Flight—Grant for Research, *Aug. 5*, 1517.
  Africa, South—Accommodation Erected for Garrison since the War, *July 30*, 747.
  Ammunition—Copper Pressure Gauges used in testing, *July 30*, 751.
  Bayonet—Result of Trials, *Aug. 5*, 1531.
  Bullet Velocities, *July 30*, 751.
  Cartridges—Breech Pressure and Muzzle Velocity, *July 30*, 750, 752.
  Cavalry
    Barracks for Scotland, *Aug. 5*, 1530, 1531.
    Sword—Result of Trials, *Aug. 5*, 1531.
  Cavan Militia Barracks, Condition of, *July 29*, 469.
  Disbanded Battalions, Information as to, *July 29*, 473.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
  Duke of York's School—Changes Projected, *July 31*, 949.
  Dunleaney, J. M., Case of, *July 25*, 122.
  Eltham Common—Decision as to War Office Works, *Aug 1*, 1207.
  Explosives—Rayleigh Committee Report, Date of Presenting, *July 29*, 463.
  Horses, Reserve of, *Aug 5*, 1517.
  Imaal Camp Roads, Maintenance of, *Aug. 1*, 1229.
  Lee-Enfield Rifles, Orders for, *Aug. 6*, 1810.
  Medical College at Millbank—Sub-letting of Contracts, *July 29*, 471.
  Messing, Cost of, *July 29*, 448.
  Militia
    Scottish Counties, Billeting Liabilities of, *July 29*, 472.
    Special Contingent Establishment, *Aug. 1*, 1203.
  Plain Clothes Regulations, Extension of, *July 29*, 465.
  Pontefract—Transfer of Pay Department, *Aug. 5*, 1516.
  Public Accounts Committee Report
    Discussion on, *Aug. 1*, 1207.
    Explanation of certain Paragraphs, *July 29*, 468.
  Radio-Telegraphic Convention, Ratification of, *July 30*, 854–858.
  Scots Greys, Accommodation for, *July 30*, 753, 754.
  Shoeburyness — Land acquired by War Office and Men employed on Works, *July 29*, 470, 473.
  Shooting Team for the Colonies, Payment to, *July 30*, 750.
  Submarine Miners, Disposal of, *July 29*, 474.
  Surveyors acting as Division Officers, Pay of, *Aug. 6*, 1818.
  Territorial Force
    Cavalry Training, &c., *July 29*, 464, 465.
    County Associations
      Grants, Audit of, *July 29*, 465.
      Secretaryships, *July 30*, 753.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendts., *July 30*, 895, 896, 901, 917, 918, 919.
  Thames Minefields and Guns, Information as to, *July 29*, 474.
  Tidworth Barracks—Mooltan Block, Cost of, *July 30*, 752.
  Volunteers—Scottish Railway, Conveyance of, *July 29*, 471.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- War Office
  - Australian Meat Packing Establishments, Inquiry into, *Aug. 5*, 1516.
  - Boot Contracts—Price Statement of, Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 6*, 1818.
  - Contracts placed in Wales, *July 30*, 752; *Aug. 6*, 1819.
  - French Polishers, Female, Employment of, *Aug. 2*, 1383.
  - Marquee Contracts, Investigation of, *July 29*, 447.
- Windsor, Victoria Barracks — Married Quarters, *Aug. 6*, 1819.
- Woolwich Arsenal
  - Case of V. Chapman, *Aug. 5*, 1517.
  - Discharges—Payment of Bonus, *July 31*, 948.
- Yeomanry
  - Armament under new Scheme, *July 29*, 464.
  - Training Proposals, *July 29*, 464.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
- Kilrush Insanitary Houses, *Aug. 6*, 1838.

Halsall
- Girls' School Scheme.
  - *Q.* Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 1*, 1195.

Halsbury, Earl of
- Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1473–1476.
- Fatal Accidents (Damages) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1694.

Hamilton of Dalzell, Lord
- Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 1145, 1147–1149.
- Lights on Vehicles Bill, *Com.*, *July 30*, 712.
- Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 928.
- Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1157–1161.

Hampstead Borough Council
- Labourers, Discharged by
  - *Q.* Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 6*, 1814.

Handsworth
- Polling District—Order Altering, *Aug. 2*, 1376; *Aug. 5*, 1471.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
- Natural History Museum, Lighting of, *July 31*, 938.
- Post Office Buildings in Carter Lane, Plastering Work of, *Aug. 2*, 1377.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*cont.*
- Trafalgar Square, Shrubs, etc., for, *Aug. 6*, 1810.
- Works Board Contracts — Additional Clause, *July 29*, 455.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 308, 316.
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 639.
- Curtailment of Liberty of Debate under new Rules, *July 26*, 269.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1576–1579, 1606.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
- Broadmoor Asylum—Case of Florence Doughty, *Aug. 1*, 1214.
- Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1124, 1125.
- Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 816–819.
- Food, Taxation of, *July 30*, 818.
- Halsall Girls' School Scheme, *Aug. 1*, 1195.
- Income Tax Deduction, Allowance for Depreciation of Capital, *July 30*, 816, 817.
- Manufactured Articles, Import Duty on, proposed, *July 30*, 818.
- Motor Cars, Taxation of, *July 30*, 817.
- Neston and Parkgate School Accommodation, *Aug. 1*, 1218.
- State Banking Corporation Prosecution, Decision as to, *Aug. 1*, 1195.

Harris, Mr. Leverton [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
- Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 806–812.
- Financial Position of the Country, *July 30*, 807–811.
- Income Tax as Financial Reserve in Case of War, *July 30*, 807, 808.
- Sugar Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *July 30*, 809.
- Woolwich Arsenal—Case of J. Chapman, *Aug. 5*, 1517.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 344.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Admiralty Officials, Press Communications by, *July 29*, 462; *July 31*, 946, 947.
- Boxes, Imported—Marking Regulations, *July 29*, 442.
- Civil Service
  - Admissions, Transfers, etc., during last Twenty-five Years, *July 29*, 456.
  - Grievances—Tribunal to deal with proposed, *July 31*, 974, 975.

[*cont.*

Hay, Mr. C. G. D.—*cont.*
- German Naval Expenditure, *Aug. 6*, 1816.
- Pacific Cable Board—Emoluments of Sir H. Primrose, *Aug. 1*, 1192.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
- Agriculture Departmental Committee of Inquiry—Reports and Recommendations of, *July 25*, 173.
- Agriculturists planted on Economic Holdings, Assistance to, *July 25*, 172.
- Economic and Industrial Condition of Ireland, *July 25*, 173–176.
- Railway Rates and Charges, *July 25*, 178.
- Winter Dairying in Ireland, Encouragement of, *July 25*, 177.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con., July 26*, 298, 302, 316, 319, 321, 335–339, 342.
- Evicted Tenants' (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 29*, 508, 526, 553.
- Low Valley Roman Catholic School, *July 25*, 235, 236.

Hedges, Mr. A. J. [Kent, Tonbridge]
- Mile End Poor Law Guardians' Contracts, *July 31*, 941.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, N., Lancaster]
- Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1119–1121.

Helmsley, Lord [Yorks, N.R., Thirsk]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con., July 29*, 683, 684.
- Small Landholders' (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Aug. 6*, 1859–1861, 1914–1917.

Hemphill, Lord
- Evicted Tenants' (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1777–1782.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Buckinghamshire, Wycombe]
- *Daily Graphic* Picture of 26th inst., *July 30*, 779.

Herbert Estate
- Sale of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 444.

Herries, Lord
- Secondary School New Regulations—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 74–76.

Hervey, Captain F. W. F. [Bury St. Edmunds]
- Navy
  - Cruisers
    - Construction Programme, *July 31*, 1006, 1007.
    - Police Duties of, *July 31*, 1007.

Hervey, Captain F. W. F.—*cont.*
- Navy—*cont.*
  - "Dilke," Return, Misleading Nature of, *July 31*, 1004.
  - Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy as to, *July 31*, 1008.

Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Higham, Mr. J. S. [Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby]
- Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1455.

Hill, Sir C. L. [Shrewsbury]
- Congo—British Policy and Obligations, *Aug. 1*, 1298–1300.
- Zanzibar
  - Administration of, *Aug. 1*, 1300.
  - Coast Strip, Abolition of Slavery in, *July 31*, 952.

Hill, Viscount
- Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 1156.

Hills, Mr. J. W. [Durham]
- Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Deduction for Propelling Power Bill, *Com., Aug. 1*, 1371, 1372.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hants, New Forest]
- New Forest—Common Rights of Captain Reynolds, *July 30*, 777.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Bristol, E.]
- Salt Tax, Abolition of, *July 31*, 949.
- Sugar—Indian Representations as to Convention, *July 31*, 949.

Hogan, Mr. M. [Tipperary, N.]
- Borrisokane Police Force on 7th August, *July 31*, 970.

Holme Lacy
- Scudamore Charity, Administration of.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *July 31*, 943.

Holt, Mr. R. D. [Northumberland, Hexham]
- Africa, South—Rebate of Customs Duties on Goods for Garrison, *Aug. 6*, 1823.
- Colonial Import Duty on Articles for the Forces, *July 25*, 129.
- Navy—Battleships, Annual Refit, *Aug. 6*, 1816.

Home Office
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.
- *Under-Secretary*—Mr. H. Samuel.
- Contracts, Alterations in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 31*, 934.
- Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Horniman, Mr. E. J. [Chelsea]
  Foreign Office Examinations—Exclusion of Geography, *July 29*, 449.
  Post Office Buildings in Carter Lane, Plastering Work of, *Aug. 2*, 1377.

House of Commons
  See under Parliament.

House of Lords
  See under Parliament.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
  Soldier Employed at North Wall Goods Store, *July 25*, 126, 127.

Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Humber Conservancy Bill
  c. 3R.* *July 25*, 106.
  l. Commons Amendts., *Con.** *July 29*, 378.
  Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
  Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 828–832.
  Fiscal Policy
    Free Trade System, Failure of, *July 30*, 830–832.
    Manufactured Articles, Import Duty on, Proposed, *July 30*, 829.
  Indian Salt Tax, Abolition of, *July 31*, 949.
  Navy — Mediterranean, Destroyers required in, *July 29*, 462.

Hyde
  Postmen's Duties
    Q. Mr. D. Schwann ; *A.* Capt. Norton, *July 31*, 957.

Hyde, Mr. C. G. [Wednesbury]
  Consols, Government Purchases of, *Aug. 5*, 1521.

Hyde Estate
  Reinstatement Claim of T. Bullman.
    Q. Mr. W. Abraham ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 939-940.

Iceland
  Autonomy, Danish Decree as to.
    Qs. Mr. John O'Connor, *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 6*, 1825.

Ilminster
  Ditton Street School Children, Church Attendance of.
    Q. Mr. Montgomery ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 6*, 1807.

Imperial Service Medal
  Conditions of granting.
    Q. Mr. Crooks ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 1*, 1203, 1204.

Imports and Exports
  See Exports and Imports.

Imported Watch Cases Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 25*, 12.
  Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Imprisonment for Debt
  Legislative Proposals for dealing with.
    Q. Mr. Pickersgill ; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 29*, 494.

Income Tax
  Abatements
    Delay in paying.
      Qs. Lord R. Cecil ; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 6*, 1830.
    New System, Working of.
      Q. Mr. E. Cecil ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 133.
      Q. Mr. C. Grant ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 5*, 1521.
  Deductions—Allowance for Depreciation of Capital.
    Os. Mr. Harmood-Banner, *July 30*, 816, 817.
  Financial Reserve in case of War.
    Os. Mr. L. Harris, *July 30*, 807, 808.
  Graduation of.
    Os. Mr. Curran, *July 30*, 814.

India
  Bengal
    Estate Schools in Eastern Bengal and Assam, Report on.
      Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Aug. 1*, 1199.
    Moti Lal Singh, Arrest of.
      Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 759.
    Mymensingh Riots, Cause of.
      Q. Sir H. Cotton ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 756.
    Police Action for Libel, Procedure in.
      Qs. Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Cox ; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Aug 6*, 1822, 1823.
    Political Missionaries, Advertisements for.
      Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 757.
  Bombay
    Political Department Staff—Return ordered, *July 26*, 240.
    Salt gathered on Sea-shore—Prosecution Case.
      Q. Mr. H. Cox ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 29*, 443.
  Chenab Canal—Effect on Value of Land.
    Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 759.
  Executive and Judicial Functions, Separation of.
    Qs. Sir E. Cotton, Mr. Rees ; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 755, 756.
  Factories, Child Labour in.
    Q. Mr. T. Davies ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July* 30, 758.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Flogging as Judicial Punishment—Report on.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 25*, 119.

Grievances

Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 743.

Proposals for redressing.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *July 30*, 760.

Hindustan and *India* Newspapers—Sentences on Editors.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Aug. 6*, 1821.

Income Tax System, Revision of, proposed.
Q. Sir S. King; A. Mr. Morley, *July 31*, 944.

Land Taxation System.
Q. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 742.

Native States—Powers of Chiefs.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *July 30*, 760.

Official Visit of Secretary proposed.
Q. Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 29*, 444.

Plague—Inoculation, Effect of.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 25*, 127, 128.

Police Service for Pension.
Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 31*, 945.

Punjab

Lahore Rioters, Sentences on.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Aug. 6*, 1821, 1822.

Lal Rajpat Rai, Case of.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 759, 760.

Land Revenue System in.
Q. Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 742.

Tetanus in.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 31*, 945.

Rupee

Circulation of.
Q. Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 25*, 127.

Profit on Coinage.
Qs. Sir E. Sasson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 480, 481.

Salt Tax, Abolition of.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 31*, 949.

India Office

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Under-Secretary—Mr. C. E. H. Hobhouse.

"Indian Sociologist"

Matter appearing in.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 757, 758.

Indians

Arrival in England—Arrangements for Assistance and Advice.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Aug. 6*, 1821.

Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Ireland

Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon, A. Birrell.

Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.

Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.

[*For* particular Places, Estates, etc., *see their names.*]

Agrarian Outrages

Offences included in Returns.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1550, 1551.

Prosecution at Summer Assizes.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug, 5*, 1551.

Statistics for 1906 and 1907.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 112, 146, 147; *Aug. 5*, 1525.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department *see that title.*

Audit of Government Accounts.
Qs. Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 30*, 743; *July 31*, 940, 941.

Chief Secretary, Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Condition of

Allegations as to Lawlessness—Government Attitude towards Disturbances in Grazing Districts, etc.,
Os. Mr. W. Long, *July 25*, 212–215; Mr. Birrell, 221–226.

Economic and Industrial Condition of the Country.
Os. Mr. Hayden, *July 25*, 173–176; Mr. Birrell, 220.

Persons under Police Protection.
Q. Mr. W. Long; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 119, 120.

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

Crown Prosecutions in 1907.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1836.

Education, *see that title.*

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
- Evictions
  - Instructions to Inspectors when Inquiring into Reinstatement Claims—Presented, *Aug. 1*, 1185.
  - Notices—Return Presented, *Aug. 2*, 1375; *Aug. 5*, 1470.
  - Reinstatements on certain Estates, Terms of.
    - *Os.* Lord Eversley, *July 30*, 731; Earl of Crewe, Lord Ashbourne, Earl of Donoughmore, 732.
  - Tenants of "Plan of Campaign" Estates—Return Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1470, 1514.
- Government Institutions, Supplies annually procured by, etc.—Return Presented, *July 29*, 439.
- Hospitals and Charities, Vote for, *July 31*, 1076; *Aug. 1*, 1238.
- Labourers Acts and Cottages, *see title* Labourers (Ireland) Acts.
- Land Commission, Land Judge's Court, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*
- Law Charges, Vote for, *July 31*, 1062; *Aug. 1*, 1237.
- Lord-Lieutenant's Household, Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.
- MacDonnell, Sir A., Cause of Visit of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Staveley-Hill; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1837, 1838.
- Policy of Chief Secretary.
  - *Os.* Mr. W. Long, *July 25*, 209–216; Mr. G. Clark, 218; Mr. Barrie, 226-228; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 229.
- Poor Law, *see that title.*
- Public Works and Buildings, Vote for, *July 31*, 1052; *Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Queen's Colleges, Vote for, *July 31*, 1068; *Aug. 1*, 1237.
- Record Office, Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.
- Trade Statistics, Delay in Circulating.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31*, 972.
- Treasury Subventions, Policy of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Butcher, *July 25*, 182, 183; Mr. Clancy, 184; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 188-192, 194; Mr. T. W. Russell, 194.
- Valuation and Boundary Survey, Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.
- Works Board
  - Accountant, Appointment of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Delany, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. Runciman, Mr. Speaker, *July 30*, 784.
  - Staff, System of Appointing.
    - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Runciman, *July 29*, 458.

Irish Council Bill
- *c.* 2R., *July 29*, 693.

Isaacs, Mr. R. D. [Reading]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 599-602.

Isle of Man
- Company Law, Conference as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 30*, 774.

Jamaica
- Earthquake—Vote for Grant-in-Relief, *July 31*, 1072; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

James of Hereford, Lord
- Bills—Printing to show what parts have been passed by means of the closure, proposed, *July 29*, 398.
- High Court of Justice, King's Bench Division—Appointment of additional Judge, *July 29*, 392.

Japan
- Battleships "Satsuma" and "Aki," armament of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 947.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburgh]
- Burma Evictions from Lanmadaw, *Aug. 6*, 1820.
- Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1685. *Com.*, *Aug. 6*, 1975–1977, 1986.
- Superiors, Rating of, *Aug. 6*, 1809.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham]
- Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1356, 1371.
- Naval Dockyards
  - Private Yards, Allocation of Work to, *July 31*, 1046.
  - Wages—Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1028–1030.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 314.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 508.
- Kendal Telephone Exchange Charges, *July 29*, 493.
- Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 371, 372, 375.
- Railways—Irish Mail to Holyhead, *Aug. 5*, 1559.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1620.
- Supply—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 31*, 1134.

Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvonshire, Arfon]
- Merionethshire School Teachers, Salaries of, *Aug. 5*, 1653–1655.

Jones, Sir D. B. [Swansea District]
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com., Aug. 1*, 1357–1359.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Secondary School Teachers, Superannuation of, *July 25*, 141.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Butter, Irish—Railway Delays in Transit, *July 29*, 487.
Deel River—State of Askeaton Weir, *July 31*, 964.
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com., Aug. 1*, 1354, 1364, 1369.
Shannon River Fishery—Inquiry proposed, *July 31*, 964.
Sittings of the House—Relief of Officials during Long Sittings, *Aug. 1*, 1231.

Judicial Statistics
Ireland Criminal Statistics Presented, *July 30*, 697, 740.

Juvenile Offenders
Detention while Awaiting Trial.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 1*, 1198.

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Cape Colony Trade Statistics for 1907, *Aug. 1*, 1216, 1217.
Channel Islands and Isle of Man Company Law, Conference as to, *July 30*, 774.
Port of London—Legislative proposals, *Aug. 1*, 1216.
Railways—London and North-Western Company
Rates of, *Aug. 1*, 1196.
Tank-engines used by, *July 30*, 775.
Saville's Crossing Fatality, *July 30*, 745.
State Banking Corporation Prosecution, Decision as to, *Aug. 1*, 1195.
Tobacco Trusts, Proposals for dealing with, *July 30*, 745.

Kekewich, Sir G. W. [Exeter]
Diplomatic and Consular Service-Pension system, *Aug 6*, 1827.
Education Board Statistics, Form of, *Aug. 6*, 1836.
Exeter Income Tax Distraints—Case of Mr. H. Hems, *Aug. 6*, 1830, 1831.
School Hygiene Congress, Delegates to, *Aug. 6*, 1835.

Kendal
Telephone Exchange Charges.
Qs. Mr. Stewart-Smith, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Capt. Norton, *July 29*, 493.

Kendal Corporation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Cavan Militia Barracks, Condition of, *July 29*, 469.
Lislea—Case of H. McCabe, *July 29*, 459.
Lismacanigan and Dungimmon—Police attendance at Meetings, *Aug. 5*, 1554.

Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 29*, 377.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Kenyon, Lord
Dairy Industry, State Control of, proposed, *July 25*, 12–14.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. [Shropshire Newport]
Evicted Tenants' (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 29*, 508–511, 542.
Small Landholders' (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Aug. 6*, 1868–1872.

Kettle, Mr. T. M. [Tyrone, E.]
Cloughfin Postal Facilities, *July 25*, 117.
Cookstown—Railway Rates on Goods, *July 25*, 116.
Cromer, Lord
Grant to, *July 30*, 867–873.
Pension of, *July 25*, 131.
Egyptian Attack on British Officers—Punitive operations against Denshawi Village, *July 30*, 871, 872.
Emigration Notices displayed in Post Offices, *July 31*, 972.
Soudan, Egyptian Troops in, *July 25*, 132.

Kilbride
Reinstatement claim of Miss A. Connor.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25*, 148.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con., July 26*, 307.
Evicted Tenants' (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 29*, 520, 521.

Kilbroney
McGuill, James, Case of.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1225.

Kilcoleman Patrickswell
Case of Mr. O'Farrel.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1840.

Kilkeel
Labourers' Cottages Grant.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Cherry *Aug. 5*, 1547, 1548.

Kilkenny
Parliamentary Election—New Member Sworn for South Kilkenny, *Aug. 1*, 1233.

Killery's Divorce Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Kilrush
Insanitary Houses, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Halpin ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1838.

King, Mr. [Cheshire, Knutsford]
Hague Conference—Arbitration v. War, Progress made with Negotiations, *Aug. 1*, 1249–1253.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
India
Income Tax System, *July 31*, 944.
Police Service for Pension, *July 31*, 945.

King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 25*, 1.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* *Aug. 1*, 1184.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1374.

Kingswood (Whitfield Tabernacle School-room, etc.) Charity Bill
l. 2R.* *July 25*, 3.
Com. and *Rep.* *Aug. 1*, 1177.
3R., *Aug. 6*, 1805.

Kinvara
Crops, Condition of.
Q. Mr. Duffy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 444.

Knockanes
Case of D. Healy.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 6*, 1814, 1815.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts
Clause 19, Advances under.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 970, 971.
Inspectors—Adequacy of Staff.
Q. Mr. Meagher ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1838.
Loans
Capital Duty on.
Qs. Mr. Ffrench ; Mr. J. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 5*, 1557, 1558.
Repayment of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31*, 972.

Ladybank Sewerage, Drainage, and Water Provisional Order Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Lagos
Spirits, Import Duty on
Q. Mr. C. Roberts ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 1*, 1209.
Timber Concessions to Mr. Brown.
Q. Mr. Alden ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 479.

Laidlaw, Mr. R. [Renfrew, E.]
Civil Service Boy Clerks—Preference given to Londoners, *July 29*, 441.
Council of India Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 6*, 1978.
India—Official Visit of Secretary proposed *July 29*, 444.
Liquor Traffic—Scottish Legislative Proposals, *July 29*, 497.
Straits Settlements—Gambling in Federated Malay States, *July 29*, 475.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Devon, South Molton]
Battleships of "Dreadnought" Type—Construction by Foreign Powers, *July 31*, 1023.
Dockyard Wages — Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1037, 1038.
Repairs, Policy as to, and Expenditure on, *July 31*, 1020–1023.
Strength of the Navy, *July 31*, 1024.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S. E.]
Committee, Scottish Grand, Obstruction in, *July 26*, 288.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1671.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1898-1900.
Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1582–1585.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *July 29*, 377.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* *Aug. 2*, 1375.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Chancellor—Right Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Land Commission (Ireland)
[*See also names of places and estates*].
Book-keeping System.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1522.
Report (1906-7) Presented, *July 29*, 384, 439.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1062 ; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Land Purchase (Ireland)
[*See also names of places, estates, etc.*]
Annuities—Facilities for Payment in Stock, &c.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 6*, 1842, 1843.
Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, Text of.
Os. Mr. J. Redmond, *July 25*, 154, 156; Mr. T. W. Russell, 154, 155, 158; Mr. Moore, 154–158.
Intimidation of Graziers, etc., Measures for dealing with.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1549, 1550.
Titles, Fee for Registering etc.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 446, 447.

Land Registry
Accounts (1906–7) Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1471, 1513.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1061; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854
Reprint of.
Q. Mr. Younger; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 2*, 1381.

Land Values
Taxation of, proposed
Os. Mr. Curran, *July 30*, 814.

Land Values (Scotland) Bill
Deputation of 28th June, Reply to.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 25*, 151.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 594, 656, 686.
Darfield School Accommodation, *July 29*, 490.
Education Rates—Prosecution of Passive Resisters, *Aug. 5*, 1537.
Merionethshire Teachers, Salaries of, *Aug. 5*, 1634-1638.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1857.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1668.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Bills
Date of sending Measures to the House of Lords, and Time allowed for Discussion, *July 30*, 732–734.
Printing to show what Parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 397.
Congo Free State Administration, *July 29*, 431.
Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1480–1482.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*cont.*
Cromer, Earl of, Grant to, *July 30*, 700–702.
Elementary Schools, Provision of, Allocation of Grant of £100,000, *July 25*, 17–20.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1702, 1706-1718.

Lardner, Mr. J. C. R. [Monaghan]
Ancketill Grove, Disposal of, *July 30*, 782.
Beekeeping—Measures for dealing with Foul Brood, *July 30*, 746.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1398–1401.
Rating System, Irish, Revision of, *July 30*, 783.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
Sugar—Brussels Convention, Effect of, and Government Decision as to, *Aug. 1*, 1240-1245.
Transvaal Mines—Native Labour Supply, *July 29*, 477.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
Agricultural Organisation Society, Grant to—Controversy with Agriculture Department, *July 25*, 199.
Agriculture Department, Vice-President—making a non-Parliamentary Office, proposed, *July 25*, 199.
China — Closing of Shanghai Opium Houses, *July 25*, 115.
Congo Free State—Belgian Administration, Charges of Cruelty to Natives, etc., *Aug. 1*, 1280-1282.
Egyptian Attack on British Officers—Punitive Operations against Denshawi Village, *Aug 1*, 1282-1285.
Macedonia, European Policy as to, *Aug. 1*, 1285-1286.

Law Charges
Votes for, *July 31*, 1061; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Law Courts
Ireland, Vote for, *July 31*, 1062; *Aug. 1*, 1237.
King's Bench Division Judges
Additional Judge—Address to the King.
Os. Lord Loreburn, *July 29*, 385; Lord Alverstone, 388; Lord James of Hereford, 392.
King's Answer to the Address, *July 26*, 238.
Work of (1905-1906)—Return Ordered, *July 26*, 241.
Supreme Court
Rules Presented, *Aug. 2*, 1376; *Aug. 5*, 1471.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1061; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
- Admiralty Foundry Work supplied by Ayrshire Foundry Company, *Aug. 6*, 1817.
- Civil List Pensions as shewn in Finance Accounts, *Aug. 6*, 1844–1846.
- D'Aberquerqe, Lord, Pension of, *Aug. 6*, 1844.
- Hague Conference Resolution as to Limitation of Armaments, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
- Navy—Offences and Punishments during 1906, *Aug. 6*, 1817.
- Pensions paid to Heirs of certain Peers, *July 31*, 936, 975, 976.
- Public Accounts Committee Report
  - Discussion on, *Aug. 1*. 1207.
  - Explanation of certain Paragraphs, *July 29*, 465.
- Unemployed Grant, Proposals for, *Aug. 6*, 1833, 1834.
- Windsor Victoria Barracks — Married Quarters, *Aug. 6*, 1819.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hampshire, Fareham]
- Navy
  - Battleships
    - Construction Programme, *July 31*, 987.
    - "Dreadnought" Type—Construction by Foreign Powers, *July 31*, 992.
    - Return, Classification of Ships in, *July 31*, 992, 1000.
  - Cruisers
    - Armoured Cruisers of Twenty Years of Age, Efficiency of, *July 31*, 992.
    - Construction Programme, *July 31*, 993.
  - Repairs, Policy as to Expenditure on, *July 31*, 995–997.
  - Strength—"Dilke" Return, Misleading Nature of, *July 31*, 991, 992.
  - Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Policy as to, *July 31*, 994.

Leeds Corporation Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill
- *l.* 2R, *July 25*, 8.
  - *Com.* and *Rep.*, *Aug. 1*, 1175, 1177.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 6*, 1805.

Legal Expenses
- Vote for, *July 31*, 1061 ; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill
- *l.* 3R., *Aug. 1*, 1145.

Leitrim
- Condition of—Police Reports
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1552.

Levy, Sir M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
- Manchester — Railway Allowances for Cartage, etc., *July 31*, 942.

Lewis, Island of
- Ballinakill Burial Ground, Site for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 31*, 963.
- Cottars, Land Tenure of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 25*, 111.
- Shader Landing Place.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 31*, 963.
- Stornoway—Carloway Road, Grant for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 31*, 962, 963.

Liddell, Mr. H. [Down, W.]
- Patents—Appeals awaiting Hearing, *July 31*, 961.

Light Railways Act
- Continuation, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Col. A. Gardner ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 486.

Lights and Lighthouses
- Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. R. Rea ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 484.
- Northern Lights Commissioners — Purchases of Land since 1890.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd George, *July 25*, 115.

Lights on Vehicles Bill
- *l.* 2R., *July 25*, 4.
  - *Com.*, *July 30*, 705.
  - Reported from Standing Committee, *Aug. 6*, 1690.

Liquor Traffic
- Scottish Legislative Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Laidlaw ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 29*, 497.

Lisiniska
- Constabulary Post—Cases of Coughlin and Kilcawley.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1524.

Lislea
- Case of H. McCabe.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 459, 460.

Lismacanigan
- Police Attendance at Meeting on 28th ult.
  - *Qs.* Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Moore ; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1554–1556.

Llandrindod Wells Gas Bill
- *l.* *Rep.** *July 29*, 377.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1137.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*The President of the Board of Trade* [Carnarvon Boroughs]
  Belfast Harbour Trust, *July 29*, 450.
  Butter, Irish—Railway Delays in Transit, *July 29*, 487.
  Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 346.
  Channel Islands Shipping Laws, Conference as to, *July 31*, 943.
  Colonies—Work of British Commercial Agents, *July 29*, 484, 485.
  Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883, *July 26* 242.
  Consuls, Commercial Work of, *July 29*, 484.
  Cookstown—Railway Rates on Goods, *July 25*, 116.
  Exports and Imports
    Colonial Goods, Import Duties on, *July 31*, 955.
    Statistics for certain Countries (1904 and 1905), *Aug. 1*, 1185.
  Government Departments Contracts—Procedure in Cases of Dispute, *July 29*, 450.
  Light Railways Act, Continuance of, *July 29*, 486.
  Lights and Lighthouses
    Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report, *July 29*, 484.
    Northern Lights Commissioners—Land Purchase since 1890, *July 25*, 115.
  Manchester—Railway Allowances for Cartage, etc., *July 31*, 942.
  Merchant Shipping Navigation and Shipping Returns—Figures given in Annual Statement, *July 29*, 488.
  Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1354–1357, 1367, 1370, 1372; *Con.*, *Aug. 2*, 1456.
  Newbury Railway Station, *July 29*, 486.
  Railways—Traders' Complaints, Method of dealing with, *July 31*, 955.
  Trade and Commerce—Movements of Capital, *July 29*, 487.

Loch Long
  Torpedo Range, Proposals for.
    Qs. Mr. J. D. White; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 1*, 1205–1207.

Local Authorities
  Travelling Expenses, Payment of.
    Q. Mr. Rogers; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 25*, 109, 110.

Local Government Board
  President—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
  Parliamentary Secretary—Dr. Macnamara.

Local Government Board—*cont.*
  Drainage of Buildings—Power to enforce By-laws.
    Q. Mr. Luttrell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 6*, 1813, 1814.
  Report (1906–7) Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1470, 1514.
  Report—Supplements Presented, *Aug. 1*, 1185.
  Ridley Clerks, Position of.
    Qs. Mr. Alden; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 5*, 1519, 1520.
  Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
  c. Rep. July 25*, 107.
    3R.* *July 26*, 239.
  l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
  l. Com. and *Rep.* July 25*, 2.
    3R.* *July 29*, 378.
    Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
  l. 2R.* *July 31*, 925.

Local Loans Fund
  Repayments to, Vote for, *July 31*, 1079; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Bill
  c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *July 29*, 695.

Local Taxation
  See Taxation, Local.

Lockwood, Lt. Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
  Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 683.
  Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 695.

London
  Legislative Measures for, Time allotted to.
    Qs. Mr. Seaverns, Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 29*, 497.

London Corporation
  Accounts (1906) Presented, *July 29*, 384, 440.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
  l. 2R.* *July 25*, 1.

London County Council (Money) Bill
  l. 3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1137.

London and North Western Railway Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

London United Tramways Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Londonderry, Marquess of
Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 380.
Education
- Secondary Schools
  - Regulations, New—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 17, 20, 26.
  - Trust Endowments — Responsibility of the Board of Education, *July 25*, 25.
- Training Colleges, New Regulations for—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 17, 26-28.

Long, Col. C. W. [Worcestershire, Evesham]
Navy and Army Messing, Cost of, *July 29*, 448.

Long, Mr. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
Chief Secretary, Policy of, *July 25*, 209–216.
Condition of Ireland—Persons receiving Police Protection, *July 25*, 119, 212–215.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 506-507, 524, 549, 552, 553, 570–573; 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1420-1427.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1850–1853, 1877–1880.
- Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1592-1600, 1616.

Longton (Caroline Street Chapel) Charity Bill
l. Com. and *Rep.** *Aug. 1*, 1177.
3R.* *Aug. 6*, 1805.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
Agrarian Outrages reported in 1906 and 1907, *July 25*, 112, 146, 147; *Aug. 5*, 1525.
- Offences included in Returns, *Aug. 5*, 1550.

Constabulary Increase, Proposals for, *Aug. 5*, 1551.
Education Votes, Comparison of, *July 29*, 445.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1392-1397.
Galway, Leitrim, Roscommon and Sligo, Condition of, *Aug. 5*, 1552.
Land Purchase—Measures for dealing with Intimidation, *Aug. 5*, 1549.
Magistrates appointed since 1906, *July 25*, 151.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*
New Hebrides—Effect of French Contraband Trade, *July 29*, 481.
Transvaal—Liquor Supply to Natives—Legislative Proposals, *July 29*, 478.
United States Import Duty on British Works of Art, *July 29*, 483.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.

Lord Chamberlain
Viscount Althorpe.

Lord Chancellor
Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquis of Cholmondeley.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council.
Earl of Crewe.

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Ripon.

Loreburn, Lord
Lord Chancellor.
Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 382.
Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1471–1473, 1482–1484.
Elementary Schools, Provision of—Allocation of Grant, *July 25*, 57–59.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1792–1795.
Fatal Accidents (Damages) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1695.
High Court of Justice, King's Bench Division—Appointment of Additional Judge, *July 29*, 385–388.
Married Women's Property Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 10, 11, *Com.*, *Aug. 5*, 1484, 1485.
Official Communications, Steps taken to secure Secrecy of, *July 30*, 719–721.
Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1171–1173.

Lough, Mr.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Islington, W.]
Education Board Statistics, Form of, *Aug. 6*, 1836.
Endowed Schools, Masters of—Case of Wright *v.* Zetland and others, *Aug. 1*, 1218.
Neston and Parkgate School Accomodation, *Aug. 1*, 1219.
School Hygiene Congress, Delegates to, *Aug. 6*, 1835, 1836.

[*Cont.*

Lough, Mr.—*cont.*
Secondary School Regulations, Changes in, *Aug. 6*, 1834.
Special Grant, Conditions of giving, *July 25*, 144.
Swansea Education Dispute, *Aug. 6*, 1835.

Low Valley
Roman Catholic School.
Os. Mr. Boland, *July 25*, 230–232; Mr. McKenna, 232–234; Sir W. Anson, 234, 235; Mr. T. M. Healy, 235, 236.

Lowe, Sir. F. W. [Birmingham, Edgbaston]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 299, 304, 310, 318, 320, 325, 354, 357, 360.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
Rulings, *see under titles*, Questions and Speaker.

Ludlow, Lord
Lights on Vehicles Bill, *Com.*, *July 30*, 709, 710, 711.

Lunacy
Commission, Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1235.
Scotland, Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *July 29*, 695.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
Ballinamona Sale Proposals, *Aug. 6*, 1840.
Ballybricken Estate, Sale of, *Aug. 1*, 1222.
Belfast Constabulary Dispute, *Aug. 6*, 1848.
Bettyville—Case of E. Hartigan, *Aug. 6*, 1841.
Clogher East—Case of J. O'Rourke, *Aug. 6*, 1839.
Cooper Estate, Sale of, *Aug 6*, 1840.
Delmege Estate Untentanted Land, Purchase of, *Aug. 6*, 1842.
Dunraven Estate—Case of J. Micks, *Aug. 1*, 1222.
Erasmus Smith Property, Sale of, *Aug 6*, 1841.
Kilcoleman Patrickswell—Case of Mr. O'Farrel, *Aug. 6*, 1840.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1684, *Com.*, *Aug. 6*, 1977.
Croydon Vaccination Case—Cause of Death of Boy, *July 30*, 773, 774.
Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1122–1124.
Indian Grievances, Proposals for Redressing, *July 30*, 760.

Lupton, Mr. A.—*cont.*
Navy
Dockyards—Vaccination Regulations, *July 31*, 1040.
Expenditure, *July 31*, 1044.
Piccadilly Motor Omnibus Traffic, *July 30*. 772.

Luttrell, Mr. H. F. [Devon, Tavistock]
Local Government Board Powers as to Drainage of Buildings, *Aug. 6*, 1813.

Lynch, Mr. H. F. B. [Yorks, W.R., Ripon]
Macedonia
Customs Increase, Application to Budget Deficit, *Aug. 1*, 1287, 1288, 1290–1293.
Disturbed condition of, *Aug. 1*, 1289.
European Policy as to, *Aug. 1*, 1287–1295.
Military Expenditure, *Aug. 1*, 1287, 1288, 1292.
Railways—Application of Revenue from Kilometric Guarantees, *Aug. 1*, 1292–1294.
Persia, Russian Trade with, *Aug. 1*, 1294, 1295.
Russia—Anglo-Russian Negotiations, *Aug. 1*, 1294, 1295.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 593, 610, 624–626, 659–662.
Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *July 31*, 960, 961; *Aug. 5*, 1650, 1651.
New Hebrides Convention, Alterations in, *July 30*, 763.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*; *Aug. 6*, 1925.

Macdonald, Mr. J. A. M. [Falkirk Burghs]
Navy—Battleship Construction Programme, *July 31*, 1041.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendments, *July 30*, 897–901.

MacDonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
Bills not to be proceeded with, *July 26*, 264, 265.
Business, Method of conducting, *July 26*, 262–264.
Curtailment of Liberty of Debate under new Rules, *July 26*, 263.
Russia, Negotiations for Agreement with, *July 29*, 481.
Session, Duration of, *July 26*, 264.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berks, Newbury]
India—Punjab, Case of Lal Rajpat Rai, *July 30*, 759, 760.
Motor Omnibus Accidents, Prevention of, *July 31*, 954.

[*cont.*

Mackarness, Mr. F. C.—*cont.*
- Newbury Railway Station, *July 29*, 485.
- Orangia Union Congress, Resolutions of, *Aug. 5*, 1532, 1533.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour, Speeches in Transvaal Debate, *July 29*, 475.
  - Mines, Native Labour Supply, *July 29*, 476.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
- Congo—Belgian Administration, Charges of Cruelty to Natives, etc., *Aug. 1*, 1266–1680.
- Western Australia, Treatment of Natives in, *Aug. 1*, 1276, 1278.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*President, Board of Education* [Monmouthshire, N.]
- Broughton School Staff, *July 25*, 111.
- Darfield School Accommodation, *July 29*, 490.
- Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1097–1100, 1101, 1103, 1106, 1108, 1112, 1121.
- Education (Provision of Meals) Act, Application of, *July 25*, 143.
- Gaelic League, Educational Work of, *July 31*, 973.
- Glamorganshire Non-Provided Schools, Estimate for, *July 25*, 141.
- Halsall Girls' School Scheme, *Aug. 1*, 1195.
- Ilminster—Church Attendance of Ditton Street School Children, *Aug. 6* 1807.
- London Schools, Income of, *Aug 6*, 1813.
- Low Valley, Roman Catholic School, *July 25*, 232–234.
- Medical Department, Cost of, *July 25*, 141.
- Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *July 31*, 959–961 ; *Aug. 5*, 1540–1542, 1630, 1639–1641, 1647, 1651, 1659, 1669.
- Monmouthshire Schools Expenditure, *July 25*, 142.
- School Hygiene Congress, Invitations to, *July 25*, 140.
- Schools Building Grant, Proposal for, *July 29*, 491.
  - Regulations, Issue of, *July 30*, 777.
- Secondary School Teachers, Superannuation of, *July 25*, 142.
- Training Colleges
  - Candidates, Interviews with, *July 31*, 957, 958.
  - Church of England Expenditure since 1895, *Aug. 5*, 1542.
- Whitefield—Case of Ranelagh Foundation, *July 25*, 142, 143 ; *July 31*, 958.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*Parliamentary Secretary Local Government Board* [Camberwell, N.]
- Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1104.
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1965.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
- Business of the House, Course of, *July 29*, 499.
- Cromer, Lord, Grant to — Breach of Privilege by the House of Lords, *July 31*, 977, 978.
- Egypt
  - British Officers, Attack on—Punitive Operations against Denshawi Village, *Aug. 1*, 1311.
  - Khedival School of Law, Rectorship of, *July 30*, 768.
  - Special Tribunal, Proposals as to, *July 30*, 767, 768.
  - *Indian Sociologist*, Matter appearing in, *July 30*, 758.
- Navy—Mediterranean, Destroyer required in, *July 29*, 463.
- Peerages, Sale of—Publication of *Traffic in Titles*, *July 25*, 144, 145.
- Pensions paid to Heirs of certain Peers, July *31*, 976.
- Transvaal—Sir P. Fitzpatrick's Attack on Under-Secretary, *July 31*, 971.
- Worcester Election Petition Prosecutions, *July 29*, 494.
- Works Board Accountant, Appointment of, *July 30*, 784.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
- Ardglass Harbour — Cost of removing Churn Rock, *Aug. 5*, 1542.
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Com.*, *July 29*, 674.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, Clause 12 —Ballymena Rural Council Resolution, *Aug. 1*, 1223.
- Kilbroney—Case of J. McGuill, *Aug. 1*, 1225.
- Kilkeel Labourers' Cottages Grant, *Aug. 5*, 1547.
- Poor Law—Case of E. Farrell, *July 30*, 780 ; *Aug 5*, 1546.

McVeigh, Mr. C. [Donegal, E.]
- Stokes Estate — Case of J. Monaghan, *Aug. 1*, 1221.

Macedonia
- Customs Increase, Application to Budget Deficit.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lynch, *Aug 1*, 1287, 1288, 1290–1293.
- Disturbed condition of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lynch, *Aug. 1*, 1289.

[*cont.*

Macedonia—*cont.*
European Policy as to.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 1*, 1259; Mr. H. Law, 1285-1286; Mr. Lynch, 1287-1295; Mr. G. Greenwood, 1296-1298; Mr. Rees, 1303; Sir E. Grey, 1318.
Military Expenditure.
Os. Mr. Lynch, *Aug. 1*, 1287, 1288, 1292.
Railways, Application of Revenue from Kilometric Guarantees.
Os. Mr. Lynch, *Aug. 1*, 1292-1294.

Mackerel
Irish Trade with United States.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 766, 767.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
Navy — Battleship Construction Programme, *July 31*, 1041.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendments, *July 30*, 910-912.

Magistrates
Appointments since 1906.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Flavin, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 25*, 151, 152.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
Education—Special Grant, Issue of Regulations, *July 30*, 777.

Mahoney Estate
Sale of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 55*, 146.

Mail Service
See under Post Office.

Mallet, Mr. C. E. [Plymouth]
Army Plain Clothes Regulations, Extension of, *July 29*, 465.
Endowed Schools, Masters of—Case of Wright *v.* Zetland and others, *Aug 1*, 1218.
Hague Conference, Subjects to be discussed at, *July 25*, 132.
National Telephone Company Agreements, Stamp Duty on, *July 25*, 117.
Telephone Provincial Charges *July 29*, 440.

Malta
Marriage Fees.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 5*, 1518.

Manchester
Railway Allowances for Cartage, etc.
Q. Sir M. Levy; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 942.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill
c. Con. July 25*, 106.
3R.* *July 29*, 438.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 31*, 925.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Notts., Mansfield]
Conferment of Honours—Setting out Public Services in Patents, proposed, *July 31*, 973, 974.
Cromer, Lord, Grant to—Breach of Privilege by the House of Lords, *July 31*, 977.
Parliamentary Elections—Second Ballot System, *July 31*, 974.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]
Channel Islands and Isle of Man Company Law, Conference as to, *July 30*, 774.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill
Facilities for.
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 6*, 1843, 1844.

Marriages
Ireland—Report (1906) Presented, *Aug. 5*, 1470, 1514.
Scotland—Report Presented, *July 29*, 384, 439.

Married Women's Property Bill
l. 2R., *July 25*, 10.
Com., *Aug. 5*, 1484.
Rep. Aug. 6*, 1805.

Maryborough
Petty Sessions—Case of T. L. Hodgins.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 966.

Mason, Mr. J. F. [Windsor]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1909.

Massereene, Viscount
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1762, 1763.

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill
c. 2R.* *July 26*, 376.
Com., *Rep.*, and 3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1372.

Mauritius
Cameron, Mr., Case of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 952.

Mayo, Earl of
Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 381.
Bills—Printing to show what Parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 397.
Congo Free State Administration, *July 29*, 419.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1771-1777.
Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 926, 927.

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]
Labourers Acts Inspectors, Number of, *Aug. 6*, 1838.

[*cont.*

Meagher, Mr. M.—*cont.*
Land Purchase Titles, Registration of, *July 29*, 446.
Poor Law Medical Service—Mr. O'Carroll's Suggestions, *Aug. 6*, 1839.

Meath, Earl of
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1487.

Meehan, Mr. P. A. [Queen's County, Leix]
Abbeyleix—Cause of Injury to Filly, *July 31*, 967.
Constabulary Duties on Farms from which Cattle have been driven, *July 3*, 966.
Poor Law Children boarded-out—Regulations as to Religion of Foster-parent, *July 29*, 489.

Meelin
Daly, Mr. O., Police Protection of.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 964, 965.

Merchant Shipping
[*For* particular Vessels, *see their names.*]
All-British Route to the East, Scheme for.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 30*, 724 ; Lord Tweedmouth, 727.
Casualties (1905–6)—Abstract of Returns Presented, *Aug. 6*, 1806.
Navigation and Shipping Returns—Figures given in Annual Statement.
Q. Mr. Bellairs ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 488.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1057 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill
l. Com., *July 29*, 393.
Rep. Aug 6*, 1690.

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill
c. Com., *Aug. 1*, 1345.
Rep. Aug. 1*, 1372.
Con. and 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1456, 1457.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 2*, 1374.
Committee Stage, Date of.
Os. Mr. Brace, *July 26*, 268.

Merionethshire
Salaries of Teachers in Non-provided Schools—Dispute as to Payment of.
Os. Lord R. Cecil, *Aug. 5*, 1563, 1629–1634, 1639, 1641, 1649 ; Mr. McKenna, 1630, 1639, 1641, 1647, 1651, 1659, 1669 ; Mr. Lane-Fox, 1634–1638 ; Sir W. Anson, 1641–1645 ; Mr. O. Williams, 1645 ; Mr. E. Cecil, 1646–1648 ; Sir J. Walton, 1648–1651 ; Mr. Lyttelton, 1650–1651 ; Mr. W. Jones, 1653–1655 ; Mr. Cave, 1655 ; Mr. Yoxall, 1656 ; Mr. Rees, 1657 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1658–1662.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Yoxall, Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. E. Cecil ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *July 31*, 959–961.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil, Lord E. Talbot, Sir W. Anson ; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Aug. 5*, 1539–1542.

Merthyr Tydfil Stipendiary Justice Bill
c. Con. July 29*, 438.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1184.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug.* 6, 1689.

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill
c. Con., *Aug. 6*, 1941.

Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 29*, 438.
l. 1R.* *July 29*, 377.
2R.* *Aug. 6*, 1689.

Meysey-Thompson, Mr. E. C. [Stafford Handsworth]
Natural History Museum, Lighting of, *July 31*, 938.

Middlesbrough, Stockton-on-Tees, and Thornaby Tramways Bill
c. 3R.* *July 26*, 239.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 29*, 378.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Midland Railway Bill
c. Rep. July 25*, 107.
*Con.**, *July 30*, 738.
3R.* *Aug.* 2, 1375.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 6*, 1689.

Midleton, Viscount
Bills—Printing to show what Parts have been passed by means of the Closure, Proposed, *July 30*, 399.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1795–1802, 1804.

Mildmay, Mr. F. R. [Devon, Totnes]
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1672.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1585–1587.

Mile End
Poor Law Guardians' Contracts, Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hedges ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 31*, 941, 942.

Militia
Irish, Proposals as to.
Q. Captain Craig ; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 25*, 126.
Recruiting—Date of Stoppage.
Qs. Viscount Turnour ; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 25*, 125, 126.
Scottish Counties, Billeting Liabilities of.
Q. Mr. Younger ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 472.
Special Contingent Establishment.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Foster ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 1*, 1203.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1084 ; *Aug. 1*, 1239.

Mines and Quarries
Welsh Quarries, Inquiry into—Constitution of Commission.
Q. Mr. E. Davies; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 6*, 1831.

Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W. [Lanark, N.W.]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1926–1930.
Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1587.
Sugar—Indian Representations as to Convention, *July 31*, 949.

Mitchelstown
Kingston College Trust, Administration of.
Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1552, 1553.

Molteno, Mr. P. A. [Dumfriesshire]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1867, 1918–1921. 1922.

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 363.

Money, Mr. L. G. Chiozza [Paddington, N.]
Postal Employees' Grievances—Recommendations of Committee, *July 29*, 498.
Trade and Commerce — Movements of Capital, *July 29*, 487.
War Office Boot Contracts—Price Statement of Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 6*, 1818.

Monkswell, Lord
Congo Free State Administration, *July 29*, 402, 436.

Monmouthshire
Schools, Expenditure in.
Q. Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25*, 142.

Montgomery, Mr. H. G. [Somerset, Bridgwater]
Ilminster—Church Attendance of Ditton Street School Children, *Aug. 6*, 1807.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Newry]
Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1683, 1684; *Aug. 6*, 1982–1985.
Railways—Payment for Irish Mail to Holyhead, *Aug. 5*, 1558-1559.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]
Antrim Labourers' Cottages Grant, *Aug. 5*, 1548.
Belfast Constabulary Dispute, *Aug. 6*, 1848.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1401–1404.
Evicted Tenants' (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 25*, 154.

Moore, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Land Purchase
Correspondence with Commissioner Bailey, *July 25*, 154-158.
Intimidation, Measures for dealing with, *Aug. 5*, 1550.
Lismacunigan and Dungimmon—Police Attendance at Meetings, *Aug. 5*, 1556.
Sugar—Operation of Additional Act of Convention, *Aug. 5*, 1536.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W.]
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, *Com.*, *Aug 2*, 1467.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for India* [Montrose Burgh.]
Bengal
Estate Schools in Eastern Bengal and Assam, Report on, *Aug. 1*, 1199.
Moti Lal Singh, Arrest of, *July 30*, 759.
Mymensingh Riots, Cause of, *July 30*, 756.
Police Action for Libel, *Aug. 6*, 1822, 1823.
Political Missionaries, Advertisements for, *July 30*, 757.
Bombay—Salt gathered on Shore, Prosecution case, *July 29*, 443.
Burma—Evictions from Lanmadaw, *Aug. 6*, 1820, 1821.
Chenab Canal—Effect on Value of Land, *July 30*, 759.
Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1673, 1677, 1683, 1684, 1685: *Com.*, *Aug. 6*, 1968, 1970, 1979, 1981, 1983, 1985, 1986.
Executive and Judicial Functions, Separation of, *July 30*, 755, 756.
Factories, Child Labour in, *July 30*, 758.
Flogging as Judicial Punishment, *July 25*, 119.
Grievances, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 30*, 743.
Hindustan and *India* Newspapers—Sentences on Editors, *Aug. 6*, 1821.
Income Tax System, *July 31*, 944.
Indian Sociologist, Matter appearing in, *July 30*, 757, 758.
Indians arriving in England, Protection of, *Aug. 6*, 1821.
Land Taxation System, *July 30*, 742.
Official Visit to India, proposed, *July 29*, 444.
Opium
Chinese Import Restrictions, *July 29*, 457.
Indian Cultivation, *July 30*, 755.
Prices in 1907, *July 25*, 119.

[*cont.*

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Plague—Inoculation, Effect of, *July 25*, 128.
- Police Service for Pension, *July 31*, 945.
- Punjab
  - Lahore Rioters, Sentences on, *Aug. 6*, 1822.
  - Lal Rajpat Rai, Case of, *July 30*, 759, 760.
  - Land Revenue System, *July 30*, 742.
  - Tetanus in, *July 31*, 945.
- Rupee, Circulation of, *July 25*, 127.
- Tea—Russian Imports, *July 25*, 118.

Morocco
- Kaid Sir H. Maclean, Terms demanded for Release of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 131.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31*, 953.
- Unrest in—Measures for Protection of British Subjects.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 5*, 1536, 1537.

Morrogh Bernard Estate
- Sale of—Cases of M. & T. Buckley.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1221, 1222.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, Arbitration under, *July 25*, 145.
- Council of India Bill, *Com.*, *Aug 6*, 1969, 1977.
- Ground Game Act—Application to Crofters, *July 31*, 962.
- Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1367-1370, 1372.
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1944, 1950, 1954, 1959, 1967.
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Discussion of, *Aug. 5*, 1561.
- Sheep—Valuation of Scottish Stocks, *Aug. 5*, 1545.
- Sutherlandshire, Dog-poisoning in, *July 31*, 962.
- Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1463.
  - Expenses Resolution, *Aug. 6*, 1987, 1989.

Motor Car (Collisions and Accidents) Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *Aug. 6*, 1849.

Motors
- Noise and Smell, Regulations for dealing with.
  - *Qs.* Mr. S. Wortley, Mr. Verney; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 1*, 1198, 1199.

Motors—*cont.*
- Omnibus Accidents, Cause and Prevention of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. Davies, Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *July 31*, 954.
- Taxation of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *July 30*, 817.

Mullaghboy
- Postman, Attack on.
  - *Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Captain Norton, *Aug. 5*, 1560.

Municipal Milk Depots Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *July 26*, 376.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
- Brewsterfield—Sale of Mr. Orpon's Estate, *Aug. 5*, 1550.
- Dromulton—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. T. Brosnan, *Aug. 5*, 1522.
- Education
  - Commissioners, Power to demand Resignation of, *July 31*, 967, 968.
  - Inspectors, Junior, System of Appointing, *Aug. 5*, 1523.
  - National School Teachers
    - Awards to, *Aug. 1*, 1202.
    - Civil Rights of, *July 26*, 243; *July* 30, 783, 784.
    - Pensions awarded, *Aug. 6*, 1808.
    - Salaries, period for paying, *July 29*, 447.
  - Schools with Attendance below Fifty, Assistant Mistress for *Aug. 2*, 1382.
  - Small Schools in Rural Districts, need for, *Aug. 5*, 1557.
- Herbert Estate, Sale of, *July 29*, 444.
- Knockanes—Case of D. Healy, *Aug. 6*, 1814.
- Morrogh Bernard Estate, Sale of—Cases of M. and T. Buckley, *Aug. 1*, 1221, 1222.
- O'Donoghue Estate—Case of D. Dineen, *Aug. 1*, 1221.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]
- Belfast Constabulary Dispute, *Aug. 6*, 1847.
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 358.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
- Agricultural Organisation Society, *July 25*, 201.

Napier, Mr. T. B. [Kent, Faversham]
- Naval Dockyards—Wages, Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1034, 1035.

Natal
War Contribution, Refunding of.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 951.

National Debt
Reduction of.
Os. Mr. Ashton, *July 30*, 814-816; Mr. Asquith, 819, 820.

National Galleries, Scotland
Vote for, *July 31*, 1067; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

National Gallery
Vote for, *July 31*, 1066; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

National Gallery, Ireland
Vote for, *July 31*, 1067; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

National Portrait Gallery
Vote for, *July 31*, 1066; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

National Telephone Company
See under Telephone Service.

National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty Bill
c. *Rep.* July 25*, (179) 107.
Con. Aug. 5*, 1513.

Natural History Museum
Lighting of.
Q. Mr. Meysey-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 31*, 938.

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading, read and Bill withdrawn, *July 29*, 695.

Navigation and Shipping Returns
See under Merchant Shipping.

Navy
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

"Ariel," Loss of—Reason for not holding Court-martial.
Q. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Dalziel; *A.* Mr E. Robertson, Mr. Speaker, *July 29*, 461.

Battleships (*see also sub-headings names of ships*).

Annual Refit.
Q. Mr. Holt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug 6*, 1816.

Construction Programme.
Qs. Mr. A. Lee, *July 31*, 987–991; Sir C, Dilke, 997–1001; Mr. J. M. Macdonald, 1041; Mr. Maddison, 1041; Mr. Rees, 1042; Mr. Shackleton, 1042.

"Dreadnought" Type, Construction by Foreign Powers.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *July 31*, 992; Mr. Lambert, 1023.

Return, Classification of Ships in.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *July 31*, 992, 1000; Sir C. Dilke, 999, 1000; Mr. Bellairs, 1009.

Navy—*cont.*
"Blake" Armament of.
Q. Mr. Starkey; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25*, 123.

Channel Fleet—Absence of Ships, Regulations governing.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 30*, 749.

China Station, Battleship for, proposed.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 31*, 1047.

Colonial Contributions towards.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *July 30*, 725–727.

Cordite

Cooling Apparatus for Storage Magazines, Decision as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 981; Mr. Bellairs, 1010, 1011; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1019; Mr. Bowles, 1044.

Tests for.
Os. Mr. Bowles, *July 31*, 1044, 1045; Sir A. Acland-Hood, 1045.

Cruisers

Armoured Cruisers of Twenty Years of Age, Efficiency of.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *July 31*, 992.

Construction Programme.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 983; Mr A. Lee, 993; Sir C. Dilke, 1003; Captain Hervey, 1006, 1007; Mr. Bellairs, 1013–1015; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1019.

Police duties of.
Os. Captain Hervey, *July 31*, 1007.

Devonport Command—Royal Marines utilised during Mobilisation.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 1*, 1204.

Dockyards (*see also subheadings names of Dockyards*).

Discharges, policy as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 986; Sir J. Benn, 1032.

Joiners, Rate of Pay.
Os. Mr. W. T. Wilson, *July 31*, 1038–1040; Mr. E. Robertson, 1041.

Private Yards, Allocation of Work to.
Os. Mr. Vivian, *July 31*, 1033; Mr. Bramsdon, 1035; Mr. Jenkins, 1046.

Vaccination regulations.
Os. Mr. Lupton, *July 31*, 1040.

Wages, Payment of Trade Union Rate.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 31*, 1025–1027; Mr. E. Robertson, 1027; Mr. Jenkins, 1028–1030; Sir J. Benn, 1030–1032; Mr. Barnes, 1032; Mr. Vivian, 1034; Mr. Napier, 1034, 1035; Mr. Bramsdon, 1036; Mr. J. Ward, 1036, 1037; Mr. Lambert, 1037, 1038.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Expenditure.
Os. Sir R. Cremer, *July 31*, 1042–1044 ; Mr. Lupton, 1044 ; Mr. Sherwell, 1048.

Graving Docks, Provision of.
Os. Mr. O. Phillips, *July 31*, 1047.

Guns
Number sent to Ordnance Factory for Repair (1903–1907).
Q. Sir. G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 5*, 1519.
Twelve-inch, Reserve of.
Q. Mr. Gretton ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 1*, 1205.

Home Fleet
Condition of
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 985.
Mobilisation, Readiness for.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 947.
Q. Mr. Gretton ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 1*, 1204.

Mediterranean, Destroyers required in.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. MacNeill ; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 29*, 462, 463.

Messing, Cost of.
Q. Col. Long ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 29*, 448, 449.

"New Zealand"—Time occupied in Repairs.
Q. Mr. Bellairs ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 30*, 748.

Offences and Punishments during 1906.
Q. Mr. Lea ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Aug. 6*, 1817.

Portsmouth Review—Closing of Gunnery Establishments, etc.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 946.

"Renown," Armament of.
Qs. Mr. Gretton ; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 30*, 747.

Repairs, Policy as to, and Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 984–986 ; Mr. A. Lee, 995–997 ; Mr. Bellairs, 1015, 1016; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1018, 1019 ; Mr. Lambert, 1020–1023 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1022.

Reserve, Strength of.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 30*, 722 ; Lord Tweedmouth, 728, 729.

Shipbuilding—Completions delayed to prevent fluctuation in building yards.
Q. Mr. Nield ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 30*, 740.

Strength.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *July 31*, 1009 ; Mr. Lambert, 1024.
"Dilke," Return, misleading nature of.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *July 31*, 991, 992 ; Capt. Hervey, 1004.

Navy—*cont.*

"Terrible," Damage and Repairs to.
Q. Viscount Turnour ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25*, 122.

Torpedo Boat Flotilla, Strength and Condition of.
Os. Mr. Gretton, *July 31*, 1046.

Torpedo Boat Destroyers
Policy as to.
Os. Mr. E. Robertson, *July 31*, 982 ; Mr. A. Lee, 994 ; Sir C. Dilke, 1002 ; Capt. Hervey, 1008 ; Mr. Bellairs, 1011, 1012.
Time taken to complete.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 26*, 241.

Volunteers
Disbandment, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton ; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25*, 122, 123.
Tyne Fatalities–Compensation Claims of Relatives.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson ; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 25*, 123.

Navy Estimates

Admiralty Office—£364,600, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep * Aug. 1*, 1239.

Application of Surpluses to meet deficiencies
Resolution [Mr. Runciman], *July 29*, 696 ; *July 30*, 920–924 ; Reported, *July 31*, 1132.

Appropriation Accounts—Referring to Committee
Resolution [Mr. Runciman], *July 29*, 696.

Educational Services—£172,500, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Martial Law—£14,200, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug. 31*, 1239.

Medical Establishments and Services—£268,700, *Com * July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Miscellaneous Effective Services—£401,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Naval Armaments—£2,348,700, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Pensions and Gratuities — £1,302,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1084 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Royal Naval Reserves—£418, 300, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Scientific Services—£65, 100, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.

Shipbuilding, Repairs, and Maintenance
Contract Work—£7,646,000, *Com.* July 31*, 1083; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1239.
Materiel—£3,035,200, *Com.* July 31*, 1083 ; *Rep.* Aug, 1*, 1239.
Personnel, Dockyards, etc. — £2,549,900, *Com., July 31*, 981 ; *Rep.* Aug. 1*, 1234.

Neston and Parkgate
School Accommodation for.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *Aug. 1*, 1218, 1219.

Newbury
Railway Station, etc.
Q. Mr. Mackarness ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 485, 486.

New Forest
Common Rights of Captain Reynolds.
Qs. Sir R. Hobart ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 30*, 777,778.

Newfoundland
Fishery Negotiations, Progress made with.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*, 1211.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent ; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug.* 6, 1828.

New Hebrides
Convention, Delay in Proclaiming and Alterations made in.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease, Mr. Lyttelton ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 763.
French Contraband Trade, Effect of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 481.
Native Labour—Inspection System, Report on.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 950.

Newton, Lord
Bills
Date of Sending to the House of Lords, Time Allowed for Discussion, *July 30*, 737.
Printing to show what Parts have been Passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 398.

Nield, Mr. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Coastguard Stations short of Men, *Aug. 6*, 1806.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 598.
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1956–1958, 1967.
Naval Shipbuilding—Completion delayed to prevent Fluctuation in Yards, *July 30*, 740.

Nigeria
Drink Traffic, Regulation of.
Q. Mr. J. C. Watson ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 5*, 1536.
Hut Tax, Amount of.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 480.
Railways
Construction in the North.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 5.* 1532.
Q. Mr. Shackleton ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 5*, 1534.

Nigeria—*cont.*
Railways—*cont.*
Rates in Southern Nigeria.
Qs. Mr. C. Roberts ; Mr. J. C. Wason ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 1*, 1208, 1209.

Norfolk, Duke of
Education
Secondary Schools, New Regulations, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 57.
Training Colleges, New Regulations for, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 53–57, 105.

North British Railway Bill
c. 3R.* *July 29*, 438.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* *July 31*, 925. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

North Metropolitan Electric Power Supply Bill
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* *July 26*, 239.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Norton, Capt. C. W.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Newington, W.]
African Steamship Company, British Government payments to, *Aug. 6*, 1828.
Caithness and Orkney Mail Delays, *July 29*, 492.
Granard Postal Facilities, *July 25*, 151.
Grantown-on-Spey Telephone Service, *Aug. 1*, 1217.
Greenwich Observatory—Negotiations as to Electric Generating Station, *Aug. 5*, 1530.
Hyde Postmen's Duties, *July 31*, 957.
Kendal Telephone Exchange Charges, *July 29*, 493.
Mullaghboy Postman, Attack on, *Aug. 5*, 1560.
Orkney Mail Boat—Ports of Call, *Aug. 5*, 1538.
Post Office
Emigration Notices, Display of, *July 31*, 972.
Ferry Up-keep, Contributions to, *July 30*, 775, 776.
Postage Rates to Canada, *July 30*, 776.
Telegraph (Money) Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 367.
Telegraph Messengers, Employment of, when over age, *July 29*, 492.
Wick and Thurso Postal Mail delays, *Aug. 5*, 1539.

Norway and Sweden
Treaty in substitution of that of 1855, Negotiations for.
Q. Mr. Ashley ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 766.

Nugent, Sir W. R. [Westmeath, S.]
- Drumraney Untenanted Land, Purchase of, *Aug. 2*, 1382.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1404.
- Upton Estate, Sale of, etc. *July 25*, 146.

Nunburnholme, Lord
- Sugar — Brussels Convention, *Aug. 5*, 1498–1501.

Nuneaton
- Charter of Incorporation Presented, *July 26*, 240 ; *July 29*, 384.

Nussey, Mr. T. W. [Pontefract]
- Pontefract—Transfer of Army Pay Department, *Aug. 5*, 1516.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
- Agrarian Outrages, Offences included in Returns, *Aug. 5*, 1551.
- Railway, Subsidy to Irish Mail, *Aug. 5*, 1559.

O'Connor, Mr. Jas. [Wicklow, W.]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 619.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
- Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug 5*, 1686–1688.
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 592, 664, 669, 674, 683.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29* (179), 537 ; 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1407–1411.
- Gardening, Instruction in, *July 25*, 147.
- Iceland—Decree as to Autonomy, *Aug. 6*, 1825.

O'Donnell, Mr. C. J. [Newington, Walworth]
- Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1675–1677, 1679, 1688 ; *Com.*, *Aug. 6*, 1968, 1969, 1980–1982.
- India
  - Grievances, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 30*, 743.
  - Land Taxation System, *July 30*, 742.
  - Punjab Land Revenue System, *July 30*, 742.

O'Donoghue Estate
- Case of D. Dineen.
  - *Q.* Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1221.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
- Admiralty Employment of Female French Polishers, *Aug. 2*, 1381.
- Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1677.
- India
  - Bengal Police Action for Libel, *Aug. 6*, 1822, 1823.
  - *Hindustan* and *India* Newspapers—Sentences on Editors, *Aug. 6*, 1821.
  - Lahore Rioters, Sentences on, *Aug. 6*, 1821, 1822.

O'Grady, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- War Office Employment of Female French Polishers, *Aug. 2*, 1383.
- Wimbledon Common, Public Rights on, *July 25*, 145.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
- Carrick-on-Shannon—Reinstatement Claim of C. Glancy, P. Moran, and M. Duffy, *July 30*, 782.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 297, 306, 326, 361.
- Deel River—State of Askeaton Weir, *July 31*, 963, 964.
- Education
  - Amalgamation of Schools, Proposals for, *Aug. 5*, 1515.
  - Inspectors' Grievances, Inquiry into, *Aug. 5*, 1548.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 525, 568, 569.
- Irish Trade Statistics, Circulation of, *July 31*, 972.
- Labourers Acts Loans, Repayment of, *July 31*, 972.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]
- Agriculture Committees, Audit Fees paid by, *Aug. 5*, 1528.
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 321.
- Clerks of Unions, Systems of Appointing, *Aug. 5*, 1526.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 513–514, 519.
- Tallow—Case of M. Cleary, *Aug. 5*, 1527.

Official Communications
- Secrecy of, Steps taken to Secure.
  - *Qs.* Viscount Esher, *July 30*, 716–719 ; Lord Loreburn, 719–721.

Official Publications
- Report Presented, *July 26*, 244.

Old Age Pensions
- Government Policy as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. P. Pease, *July 30*, 802 : Mr. Everett, 804.

Onslow, Earl of
- Armagh Urban District Council Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 379 ; *Aug. 1*, 1144.
- Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1179.
- Dairy Industry, State Control of, proposed, *July 25*, 16.
- Fatal Accidents (Damages) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 6*, 1696.
- Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R. *Aug. 1*, 1153.

Opium
Chinese
Edict for Suppression of Traffic.
Os. Mr. Rees, *Aug. 1*, 1304.
Import Restrictions.
Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 29*, 457.
Q. Sir H. Cotton ; *A.*, Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 764.
India
Prices in 1907.
Q. Sir H. Cotton ; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 25*, 119.
Restriction of Cultivation, Proposals for.
Q. Sir H. Cotton : *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 30*, 755.
International Conference—Chinese Attitude.
Q. Sir H. Cotton ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 767.

Orange River Colony
Congress of Orangia Union, Resolutions of.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 5*, 1532, 1533.
Farms, Valuation of.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 950, 951.
Loan projected for.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 951, 952.

Ordnance Survey
Gardner, Mr. J., Case of.
Qs. Mr. A. Dewar ; *As.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *Aug. 1*, 1219, 1220.

Orkney
Mail Boats
Delays in Tourist Season.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason ; *A.* Capt. Norton, *July 29*, 492.
Ports of Call.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason ; *A.* Capt. Norton, *Aug. 5*, 1538.

Pacific Cable
Vote for, *July 31*, 1072 ; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

Pacific Cable Board
Primrose, Sir H., Emoluments of.
Q. Mr. Hay ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 1*, 1192.

Paisley Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *July 29*, 438.
*Con.** *July 31*, 932.
3R.* *Aug. 2*, 1375.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 5*, 1469.

Panama Canal
British Subjects working on.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 478, 479.

Panama Canal—*cont.*
Jamaican Labour, Negotiations as to.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 6*, 1823.
Trinidad Labour
Contract, Supervision of.
Q. Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 761.
Qs. Mr. Starkey, Lord Balcarres ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 762, 763.
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 950.
Inspection of and Holidays for.
Qs. Mr. Starkey ; *As.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 25*, 129.
Q. Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 2*, 1379, 1381.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
Africa, West—Labour in San Thomé and Principé, *July 25*, 130.
Army—Submarine Miners, Disposal of, *July 29*, 474.
Cape Colony Trade Statistics for 1907, *Aug. 1*, 1216, 1217.
Colonial Preference, Policy of, *July 30*, 792–794.
Congo Free State
Annexation by Belgium, Proposals for, *Aug. 1*, 1256.
Belgian Administration, Charges of Cruelty to Natives, etc., *Aug. 1*, 1253–1258.
British Policy and Obligations, *Aug. 1*, 1258.
Corn Tax, *July 30*, 789, 790.
Defence of the Empire—Home Defence Duties of the Navy, *July 29*, 460.
Exports and Imports — Statistics for United Kingdom and Foreign Countries, *July 30*, 795–798.
Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 786-798.
Free Trade System, Failure of, *July 30*, 786-798.
Natal War Contribution, *July 31*, 951.
Navy—Guns sent for Repair (1903–1907), *Aug. 5*, 1519.
Newfoundland Fishery Negotiations, Progress made with, *Aug. 1*, 1211.
Orange River Colony
Farms, Valuation of, *July 31*, 950.
Loan for, *July 31*, 951.
Port of London — Legislative Proposals, *Aug. 1*, 1216.
Radio—Telegraphic Conventions, Ratification of, *July 30*, 857.
St. Helena—Water Tax, Revenue from, *July 31*, 951.
Sugar, Brussels Convention — Terms of Draft Protocol, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
Taxation, Broadening Basis of, proposed, *July 30*, 788, 791.

[*cont.*

Parker, Sir G.—*cont.*
- Thames Mine Fields and Guns, Information as to, *July 29*, 474.
- Transvaal
  - British Civil Servants, Position of, *July 30*, 764.
  - Chinese Labour—Applications for Repatriation, *July 25*, 128.
  - Loan of £5,000,000—Date of introducing Bill, *July 25*, 152.
  - Mines—Native Labour Supply, *July 29*, 477, 478.
  - Officials transferred to, Position of, *July 30*, 763.
  - White Labour in Mines, Restrictions on, *July 30*, 760.
- Turkey—Freight Rates to Basra, *July 25*, 130.

Parliament
- House of Commons
  - Committees, *see that title.*
  - Kitchen Committee Report Presented, *July 30*, 786.
  - Offices, Vote for, *July 31*, 1057 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.
- House of Lords
  - New Peers introduced
    - Airedale of Gledhow, Baron, *Aug. 1*, 1137.
    - Blyth of Blythwood, Baron, *Aug. 1*, 1137.
    - Swaythling of Swaythling, Baron, *Aug. 1*, 1137.
  - Offices, Vote for, *July 31*, 1057 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.
- Houses of—Vote for, *July 31*, 1052 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

"Parliamentary Debates"
- Reporting
  - Contract—Date of Termination, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. S. Roberts ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 1*, 1219.
  - Opportunity for Discussion.
    - *Q.* Mr. Byles ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 29*, 496.

Parliamentary Elections
- New Members Sworn
  - Muldoon, J., for Wicklow (East), *Aug. 2*, 1374.
  - Murphy, N. J., for Kilkenny (South), *Aug. 1*, 1233.
- Second Ballot
  - Foreign Countries, Systems in.
    - *Q.* Dr. Cooper ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 29*, 441.
    - *Q.* Dr. Cooper ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*. 1210.
  - Legislation for, proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Markham ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 31*, 974.

Parliamentary Procedure
- Anticipatory Motions Committee, Recommendations of.
  - *Qs.* Sir E. Sassoon, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. R. Duncan, Mr. Bowles ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 29*, 498, 499.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bowles ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 5*, 1561.
- Bills, *see that* Title.
- Curtailment of Liberty of Debate under New Rules.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 26*, 255, 256, 258 ; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 263 ; Mr. L. Hardy, 269 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 281.
- Session, Duration of.
  - *Os.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 26*, 245, 249 ; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 249, 251 ; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 264 ; Mr. S. T. Evans, 266.

Parliamentary Reports
- Publication, Form of.
  - *Qs.* Sir H. Vincent ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 30*, 778.

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *July 26*, 239.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 29*, 377, Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1374.

Patents
- Appeals awaiting Hearing.
  - *Q.* Mr. Liddell ; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 31*, 961, 962.

Patents and Designs (Consolidation) Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 26*, 376.

Pearce, Mr. W. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
- Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1955.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
- Africa, Central—Troops at Zomba, *July 30*, 761.
- Criminal Appeal Bill, 3R., *July 29*, 692.
- Education (Provision of Meals) Act, Application of, *July 25*, 143.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 559, 560.
- Export and Import Statistics for certain Countries (1904 & 1905), *Aug. 1*, 1185.
- Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 800–803.
- Food, Drink and Tobacco, Revenue from, *July 26*, 243.
- Morocco—Terms of Release of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 31*, 953.
- New Hebrides Convention, Delay in Proclaiming, *July 30*, 763.
- Old Age Pensions, Government Policy, *July 30*, 802.

Pease, Mr. H. P.—*cont.*
Panama Canal
British Subjects Employed on, *July 29*, 478, 479.
Trinidad Labour Contract, Supervision of, *July 30*, 761 ; *Aug. 2*, 1379.
Silver, Manufactured, Duty on, and Revenue from Licences, *July 29*, 441 ; *July 31*, 935.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1588–1590.
Sugar
Brussels Convention — Representations from Chambers of Commerce, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *July 30*, 800, 801.
Training Colleges of Church of England, Expenditure on since 1895, *Aug. 5*, 1542.
Transvaal Loan of £5,000,000, Application of, *Aug. 5*, 1531.
Worcester Election Petition Prosecutions, *July 29*, 494.
Zanzibar—Abolition of Slavery on Coast Strip, *July 31*, 953.

Pease, Mr. J. A.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
Ordnance Survey—Case of Mr. J. Gardner, *Aug. 1*, 1220.
Walpole House Farm, Rent for, etc., *Aug. 1*, 1220.
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill—Expenses Resolution, *Aug. 6*, 1988.

Peerages
"Traffic in Titles," Publication of.
Qs. Mr. MacNeill ; *As.* Sir J. Walton, Mr. Speaker, *July 25*, 144, 145.

Penrith Urban District Council Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Pensions
Payments to Heirs of Lords Rodney and Nelson and the Duke of Schomberg.
Qs. Mr. Lea ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 31*, 936, 937.
Qs. Mr. Lea, Mr. MacNeill ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 31*, 975, 976.

Persia
Russian Trade with.
Os. Mr. Lynch, *Aug. 1*, 1294, 1295.

Persian Gulf
British Patrol of.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 31*, 1048.

Peru
Trade Report Presented, *July 29*, 383.

Peterhead Harbour
Vote for, *July 31*, 1052 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill
l. 2R., *July 31*, 926.
Com. and *Rep.* * *Aug. 1*, 1183.
3R., *Aug. 5*, 1488.

Philipps, Mr. O. C. [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
Navy—Graving Docks, Provision of, *July 31*, 1047.

Piccadilly
Motor Omnibus Traffic in.
Qs. Capt. Faber, Mr. Lupton ; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 771, 772.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 594.
Imprisonment for Debt, Legislative Proposals for dealing with, *July 29*, 494.
Prisons, Treatment of Lads and Drill in, *July 25*, 139.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill
c. Rep.* *July 25*, 106.
Con., *July 26*, 239.
3R.* *July 30*, 738.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.** *Aug. 5*, 1469.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 30*, 738.
*Rep.** *Aug. 5*, 1513.
3R., *Aug. 6*, 1806.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 30*, 738.
*Con.** *July 31*, 932.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1184.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.** *Aug. 1*, 1137.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 30*. 738.
*Con.** *July 31*, 932.
3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1184.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.** *Aug. 1*, 1138.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Piers and Harbours
[*See also names of places.*]
Vote for, *July 31*, 1352 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Pirie, D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
Bills
Carrying over from one Session to another, proposed, *July 26*, 269.
Measures not to be Proceeded with, *July 26*, 270.

Plymouth, Earl of
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 1155.

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *July 26*, 376.

Police
Anti-Russian Demonstration, Action at.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 30*, 772.
Clerkenwell — Complaint made by J. T. Barlow.
Q. Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Aug. 5*, 1537.
Metropolitan—Case of George Deed.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *Aug. 6*, 1808.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1061; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Polling Districts
[*See also names of places.*]
Order Presented, *Aug. 2*, 1376; *Aug. 5*, 1471.

Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Poor Law
Children Boarded-out—Regulations as to Religion of Foster-parent.
Q. Mr. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 29*, 489.
Inspectors, Number of.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1224, 1225.
Ireland
Clerks of Unions, System of Appointing.
Q. Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1526.
Farrell, E., Case of.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 780, 781.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 5*, 1546.
Medical Service — Mr. O'Carroll's Suggestions.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 6*, 1839.
Relief in England and Wales (1906-7)—Return Ordered, *Aug. 5*, 1514.
Shirley Schools, Expenditure on.
Qs. Dr. Cooper, Mr. Cox; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 6*, 1832.

Port of London
Legislative Proposals for Next Session.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Aug. 1*, 1216.

Portishead District Water Bill
c. *Rep.* July 25*, 107.
Con. July 30*, 738.
3R.* *Aug. 2*, 1375.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 5*, 1469.

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Levenhall Extension) Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Rt.Hon. S.Buxton.
[*See also names of places*].
Carter Lane Buildings, Plastering Work for.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Aug. 2*, 1377.
Emigration Notices, Exhibition of.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Captain Norton, *July 31*, 972.
Favouritism, etc., Allegations as to.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 26*, 241.
Ferry Upkeep, Contributions to.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Captain Norton, *July 30*, 775, 776.
Grievances of Employees
Recomendations of Committee.
Q. Mr. C. Money; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 29* 498.
Report Presented, *July 25*, 159.
Letter Boxes of Sub-postmasters, Painting of.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Aug. 6*, 1807, 1808.
Mail Service — Shanghai - Hong Kong Route.
Qs. Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Aug. 2*, 1377-1379.
Parcel Post, Foreign and Colonial Warrant Presented, *Aug. 2*, 1376; *Aug. 5*, 1471.
Postage Rates to Canada.
Qs. Mr. Boulton; *As.* Captain Norton, *July 30*, 776.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1086; *Aug. 1*, 1240.

Post Office Savings Bank
Financial Position.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 30*, 769, 770.

Post Office Sites Bill
l. 2R., *July 30*, 715.
Rep. Aug. 6*, 1690.

Potatoes
Cultivation in West of Ireland, Progress made.
Os. Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 25*, 167.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
Education Act (Amendment) Bill, Proposals to, *July 26*, 274.
Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1116-1119.
Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1451.

Power Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 515 ; 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1419.
Trawling, Protection of, Additional Gunboats, proposed, *July 25*, 199, 200.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
Butter and Margerine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 348.
Exeter Income Tax Distraints—Case of Mr. H. Hems, *Aug. 6*, 1831.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1912–1914.
Wheat Duty, Revenue from, *July 25*, 117.

Prisons
[*See also names of places.*[
Drill in.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 25*, 139.
Ireland, Vote for, *July 31*, 1062 ; *Aug. 1*, 1237.
Lads, Treatment of.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 25*, 139, 140.
Scotland, Vote for, *July 31*, 1062 ; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Prisons (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1457.
Com., *Rep.*,* *Aug. 5*, 1688.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 5*, 1690.

Privy Council Office
Vote for, *July 31*, 1057 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Prize Courts Bill
c. 1R.* *Aug. 6*, 1849.

Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill
c. Con., *July 26*, 370.
3R.* *July 26*, 376.
l. 1R.* *July 29*, 385.
2R., *Aug. 5*, 1486.

Provincial Bank of Ireland
Government Business Transacted by.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 5*, 1523, 1524.

Public Accounts Committee Report
Discussion, Date for.
Q. Mr. V. Cavendish ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 29*, 499.
Qs. Captain Faber, Mr. Lea ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 1*, 1207.
Q. Mr. Morton ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 5*, 1561.
Explanation of Paragraphs in.
Q. Mr. Lea ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 465–468.

Public Health Act
Complaints against Local Councils under.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 1*, 1196.

Public Health Bill
c. Reported from Standing Committee A, *July 29*, 500.
Con. and 3R.* *July 30*, 920.
l. 1R.* *July 31*, 932.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill
c. 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1441.

Public Health (Scotland) Amendment Bill
l. 2R., *July 31*, 928.
Com. and *Rep.** *Aug. 1*, 1183.

Public Trustee Act
Rules Presented, *July 31*, 926, 934.

Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill
c. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 1233.

Qualification of Women (County and Town Councils, Scotland) Bill
l. 3R.* *July 25*, 12.
c. 1R.* *Aug. 1*, 1233.

Questions
Absence of Ministers Addressed, Remedy for.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil, Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *Aug.*, 1846.
Irrelevant, *July 30*, 760.
Notice to be Given of, *July 29*, 478, 493 ; *July 30*, 760 ; *July 31*, 954 ; *Aug. 5*, 1563.
Out of Order, *July 29*, 461, 471 ; *July 30*, 784 ; *July 31*, 959.
Sequence of.
Os. Mr. Courthope, Mr. Speaker, *July 30*, 749.
Speech may not be made during time for, *July 29*, 491 ; *Aug. 6*, 1848.
Statements Quoted in, *July 25*, 144.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]
Police at Clerkenwell, Complaint against, by J. T. Barlow, *Aug. 5*, 1537.

Radio-Telegraphic Convention
  See under Wireless Telegraphy.

Railways
  Ireland
    Rates and Charges in.
      Qs. Mr. Hayden, *July* 25, 178.
    Vote for, *July 31*, 1052 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.
  Irish Mail to Holyhead, Speed of and Payment for.
    Qs. Mr. Mooney, Mr. L. Jones, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. J. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 5*, 1558-1560.
  London and North-Western Company
    Rates, Refusal to Supply Information as to.
      Q. Sir J. Randles ; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Aug. 1*, 1195, 1196.
    Use of Tank Engines by.
      Q. Mr. Wardle ; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 30*, 775.
  Traders' Complaints, Method of dealing with.
    Q. Mr. Brigg ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 31*, 955.

Randles, Sir J. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
  Companies Bill—Date of Second Reading, *Aug. 5*, 1561.
  Railway Rates—Refusal of London and North-Western Company to Supply Information, *Aug. 1*, 1195.

Rates and Rating
  Irish System, Revision of.
    Q. Mr. Lardner ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 783.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
  Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 322.
  Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 602-606, 613-615, 628, 642, 645-647, 663, 667, 674, 677, 679, 680, 688, 691.
  Criminal Procedure — Death Sentences (1906-7), *Aug. 2*, 1380.
  Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1942, 1961, 1965.
  Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 374.
  Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill—Expenses Resolution, *Aug. 6*, 1987.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Rea, Mr. W. R. [Scarborough]
  Lights Inquiry — Date of Presenting Report, *July 29*, 484.

Record Office
  Vote for, *July 31*, 1057 ; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]
  Speeches made by—Action Proposed to be taken by Lord Chancellor, etc.
    Qs. Mr. J. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1556, 1557.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
  Agriculture Department Vote, Facilities for Discussion, *July 25*, 201-202.
  Daily Graphic—Picture Published on 20th inst., *July 25*, 140 ; *July 30*, 779, 780.
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 517, 549, 551, 553.
  Labourers Acts Loans, Capital Duty on, *Aug. 5*, 1558.
  Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, *July 25*, 154, 156.
  Questions — Absence of Ministers Addressed, *Aug. 6*, 1846.
  Railways—Subsidy to Irish Mail, *Aug. 5*, 1560.
  Reddy, Mr., Speeches of—Action of Lord Chancellor, etc., *Aug.* 5, 1556, 1557.
  Waterford Asylum — Superintendent's Powers as to Exclusion of certain Newspaper, *Aug. 1*, 1223.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
  Business of the House, Course of, *July 29*, 499.
  Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 315.
  Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 30*, 858-867.
  Daily Graphic—Picture Published on 20th inst., *July 25*, 149.
  Egypt
    British Officers, Attack on—Punitive Operations against Denshawi Village, *July 30*, 863-866.
    Educational Policy in, *July 30*, 863.
    Judicial Departments, Organisation of, *July 30*, 863.
  Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland, Encouragement of, proposed, *July 25*, 196.
  War Office Inquiry into Australian Meat-packing Establishments, *Aug. 5*, 1516.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
  Africa, Central—Admission of Protectorate to South African Customs Convention, *Aug. 1*, 1304.
  Army—Territorial Force, Audit of Grants to Associations, *July 29*, 465.
  Coffee Adulteration with Chicory, *Aug. 6*, 1832.
  Colonial Office — Under-Secretary's projected Visit to Africa, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
  Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1678-1681 ; *Com.*, *Aug. 6*, 1974.
  Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *Aug. 1*, 1301.
  Customs and Excise—Jerquer, Duties of, *July 25*, 136, 137.

[*cont.*

Rees, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
- Florists, Application of Factory Act to, *July 29*, 483, 484.
- India
  - Bengal
    - Arrest of Moti Lal Singh, *July 30*, 759.
    - Political Missionaries, Advertisements for, *July 30*, 757.
  - Chenab Canal — Effect on Value of Land, *July 30*, 759.
  - Executive and Judicial Functions, Separation of, *July 30*, 755.
  - Native States—Powers of Chiefs, *July 30*, 760.
- *Indian Sociologist*, Matter appearing in, *July 30*, 757, 758.
- Indians arriving in England, Protection of, *Aug. 6*, 1821.
- Macedonia, European Policy as to, *Aug. 1*, 1303.
- Main Roads, Maintenance of, *July 30*, 773.
- Merionethshire Teachers, Dispute as to Payment of Salaries, *Aug. 5*, 1657.
- Navy
  - Battleship Construction Programme, *July 31*, 1042.
  - China Station, Battleship for, proposed, *July 31*, 1047.
- Opium, Chinese Edict for Suppression of Traffic, *Aug. 1*, 1304.
- Persian Gulf, British Patrol of, *July 31*, 1048.
- Russia, Negotiations for Agreement with, *July 29*, 482; *Aug. 1*, 1301-1303.
- War Office Contracts placed in Wales, *July 30*, 752; *Aug.* 6, 1818.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
- Ireland—Vote for, *July 31*, 1062; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

Registrar-General's Offices
- Votes for, *July 31*, 1057, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill
- *c. Con.* and 3R.,* *July 26*, 376.
- *l.* 1R.,* *July 29*, 385.
  - 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1487.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
- Army Medical College at Millbank—subletting of Contracts, *July 29*, 470, 471.

Revenue and Expenditure
- Finance Accounts—Contingent Liabilities, Estimate of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 6*, 1829.
- Financial Position of the Country.
  - *Os.* Mr. Everett, *July, 30*, 803, 804; Mr. L. Harris, 807-811; Mr. Asquith, 820-822; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 823-825.

Revenue and Expenditure—*cont.*
- Food, Drink, and Tobacco, Revenue from.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 26*, 243.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
- Admiralty Painting work, Payment for, *Aug. 6*, 1809.
- Holme Lacy—Administration of Scudamore Charity, *July 31*, 943.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Ridsdale, Mr. E. A. [Brighton]
- Army Surveyors acting as Division Officers, Pay of, *Aug. 6*, 1818.

Ripon, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal*
- Bills
  - Date of sending Measures to the House of Lords and Time allowed for Discussion, *July 30*, 734-737.
  - Printing to show what parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 397.
- Cromer, Earl of—Grant to, *July 30*, 697-700.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *Aug 6*, 1802-1805.

Roads
- Main Roads, Maintenance of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 30*, 773.

Roads (Kerry)
- Boat-Slip Improvements.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1522.

Roberts, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
- Deaths owing to certain Occupation, *July 30*, 773.
- Lagos, Import Duty on Spirits, *Aug. 1*, 1209.
- Nigeria, Southern—Railway Rates, *Aug 1*, 1208.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
- *Board of Trade Journal*, Lessening Price of, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 1296.
- Diplomatic and Consular Attachés, Working of System, *Aug. 1*, 1295.
- Parliamentary Debates—Date of Termination of Reporting Contract, *Aug. 1*, 1219.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
- Admiralty
  - Clothing Contracts, Allocation of, *July 25*, 112.
  - Foundry Work supplied by Ayrshire Foundry Company, *Aug. 6*, 1817.

[*cont.*

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*cont.*
- Admiralty—*cont.*
  - French Polishers, Female, Employment of, *Aug. 2*, 1381.
  - Painting Work, Payment for, *Aug. 6*, 1809.
  - Press Communications by Officials, *July 29*, 462 ; *July 31*, 947.
  - Queenstown Deputation, Reply to, *Aug. 1*, 1206.
- "Ariel," Loss of, Reason for not holding Court-Martial, *July 29*, 461.
- Battleships, Annual Refit, *Aug. 6*, 1816.
- "Blake," Armament of, *July 25*, 123.
- Channel Fleet—Absence of Ships, Regulations governing, *July 30*, 749.
- Coastguards
  - Reorganisation Proposals, *July 29*, 460.
  - Stations short of Men, *Aug. 6*, 1807.
- Colonial Naval Defence, *July 29*, 462.
- Cordite, Tests for, *July 31*, 1045.
- Cruisers, Constructional Programme, *July 31*, 983.
- Defence of the Empire—Home Defence Duties of the Navy, *July 29*, 460.
- Devonport Command—Royal Marines utilised during Mobilisation, *Aug. 1*, 1204.
- Dockyards
  - Discharges, Policy as to, *July 31*, 986.
  - Joiners, Rate of Pay, *July 31*, 1041.
  - Wages, Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1027.
- French Naval Stations in the Mediterranean, *Aug. 1*, 1191, 1206.
- German Naval Expenditure, *Aug. 6*, 1816.
- Guns
  - Number sent for Repair (1903-1907), *Aug. 5*, 1519.
  - Twelve-inch, Reserve of, *Aug. 1*, 1205.
- Home Fleet
  - Condition of, *July 31*, 985.
  - Mobilisation, Readiness for, *July 31*, 947 ; *Aug. 1*, 1204.
- Japanese Battleships, Armament of, *July 31*, 947.
- Loch Long Torpedo Range, *Aug. 1*, 1206, 1207.
- Magazines, Refrigerating Machinery for, *July 31*, 951.
- Mediterranean, Destroyers required in, *July 29*, 463.
- Messing, Cost of, *July 29*, 449.
- "New Zealand"—Time occupied in Repairs, *July 30*, 748.
- Offences and Punishments during 1906, *Aug. 6*, 1817.
- Portsmouth Review—Closing of Gunnery Establishments, etc., *July 31*, 946.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*cont.*
- "Renown," Armament of, *July 30*, 747.
- Repairs, Policy as to, and Expenditure on, *July 31*, 984-986.
- Shipbuilding — Completions delayed to prevent Fluctuation in Yards, *July 30*, 740.
- "Terrible"—Damage and Repairs, *July 25*, 122.
- Torpedo Boat Destroyers
  - Policy as to, *July 31*, 982.
  - Time taken to Complete, *July 26*, 241.
- Volunteers
  - Disbandment Proposals, *July 25*, 122, 123.
  - Tyne Fatalities, *July 25*, 123.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
- Cromer, Lord, Grant to, *July 30*, 883-886.
- Egypt
  - Army of Occupation, Sum voted for, *Aug. 6*, 1826.
  - Buildings collapsing during last Twelve Months, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
  - Cairo
    - New Barracks, Ownership of, *Aug. 6*, 1826.
    - Water Supply, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
  - Company Laws, *Aug. 6*, 1826.
  - Education — Grant for European Study, *Aug. 1*, 1210.
- India—Plague, Effect of Inoculation, *July 25*, 127, 128.
- Naval Volunteer Fatalities on the Tyne, *July 25*, 123.
- Transvaal—British Indians, Position of, *Aug. 5*, 1533.

Roche, Mr. A. [Cork]
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 573.

Roe Estate
- Sale of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 30*, 781.

Rogers, Mr. F. N. [Wilts, Devizes]
- Local Authorities' Travelling Expenses, Payment of, *July 25*, 109.

Roscommon
- Condition of—Police Reports.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1552.

Roskeen
- Reinstatement Application of Mrs. Delany.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1528, 1529.

Ross-shire
  Dog-poisoning in.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 31,* 963.

Rule Committee Bill
  c. 1R.* *Aug. 6,* 1849.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Dewsbury]
  Ardglass Harbour — Cost of removing Churn Rock, *Aug. 5,* 1543.
  Beer-hawking in London, *July 31,* 953.
  Boxes, Imported—Marking Regulations, *July 29,* 442.
  Civil Service
    Admissions, Transfers, etc., during last Twenty-five Years, *July 29,* 456.
    Boy Clerks — Preference given to Londoners, *July 29,* 442.
  Consuls, Commercial Work of, *July 29,* 482, 483.
  County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act, 1877, Sum received under, *July 25,* 138.
  Customs and Excise
    Appointments, etc., *July 25,* 134–137.
    Collectors, Appointment of, *Aug. 5,* 1544.
    Jerquer, Duties of, *July 25,* 136, 137; *Aug.* 5, 1543.
    Statistical Office Clerks, Memorial from, *July 25,* 138.
    Surveyors—Promotion System, *Aug. 5,* 1544.
    Upper Section Clerks, Vacancies for, *Aug. 5,* 1543.
  Education Records, Irish—Cost of preparing Duplicates, *July 30,* 744.
  Exchequer and Audit Department
    Abstractors, Promotion of, *Aug. 6,* 1812.
    Assistant Comptroller, Duties of, *July 30,* 744.
    Colonial Audit Branch
      Clerks, Salaries, etc., of, *Aug. 6,* 1811.
      Colonial Contributions, *Aug. 1,* 1194.
    Examiners, Leave and Annual Allowances of, *Aug. 1,* 1194.
    Luncheon Regulations of Staff, *Aug. 1,* 1193, 1194.
    Officers of Old Examiner Class, Cases of, *Aug. 6,* 1810, 1812.
    Staff, Payment of, *July 31,* 940.
  Income Tax Abatements under New System, *July 25,* 133.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Ireland
    Government Accounts, Audit of, *July 30,* 743; *July 31,* 940, 941.
    National School Teachers, Insurance of, *July 31,* 971, 972.
    Trade Statistics, Circulation of, *July 31,* 972.
    Works Board
      Accountant, Appointment of, *July 30,* 784.
      Staff, System of appointing, *July 29,* 458.
  Labourers (Ireland) Acts Loans, Repayment of, *July 31,* 972.
  Land Purchase Annuities—Payment in Stock, *Aug. 6,* 1843.
  Morocco
    Terms of Release of Kaid Sir H. Maclean, *July 31,* 953.
    Unrest in—Measures for Protection of British Subjects, *Aug. 5,* 1536, 1537.
  New Forest—Common Rights of Captain Reynolds, *July 30,* 777, 778.
  Parliamentary Debates Reporting Contract—Date of Termination, *Aug. 1,* 1219.
  Parliamentary Report, Form of Publishing *July 30,* 778.
  Provincial Bank of Ireland, Government Business transacted by, *Aug. 5,* 1524.
  Railways—Subsidy to Irish Mail, *Aug. 5,* 1558–1560.
  Russia, Negotiations for Agreement with, *July 29,* 481, 482.
  Sugar—Brussels Convention, Operation of Additional Act, *Aug. 5,* 1536.
  Sugar Beet Cultivation, *July 31,* 956.
  Supply—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 31,* 1134.
  Telegraph (Money) Bill, Expenditure under, *July 25,* 134.
  Unemployed
    Grant, Proposals as to, *July 31,* 956.
    Work Provided for, *July 31,* 956.
  United States Import Duty on British Works of Art, *July 29,* 483.
  University College Grants, Report on, *July 31,* 953.
  Vehicles used by Farmers, Licences for, *July 25,* 133.
  Voters' Lists — Payment of Revising Barristers, *Aug 5,* 1520.

Rural Districts
  Medical Officers of Health and Sanitary Inspector—Return Presented, *July 29,* 439.

[*cont.*

Russell, Earl
- Lights on Vehicles Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 7; *Com.*, *July 30*, 705, 707.

Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.—*Vice-President of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department* [Tyrone, S.]
- Administrative Policy of Agriculture Department, *July 25*, 192–196.
- Agricultural Organisation Society, Irish Grant to—Controversy with Agriculture Department, *July 25*, 164, 165.
- Agriculturists planted on Economic Holdings, Assistance to, *July 25*, 168.
- Bee-keeping—Measures for dealing with Foul Brood, *July 30*, 746.
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 305, 364.
- Deel River—State of Askeaton Weir, *July 31*, 964.
- Dublin
  - School of Art, Appointment of Headmaster, *July 25*, 163.
  - Technical School, Dispute between Agricultural Board and City Corporation, *July 25*, 163, 164.
  - Veterinary College, Grants to, *July 25*, 163.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 560.
- Income and Expenditure of the Department, *July 25*, 166, 169.
- Land Purchase—Correspondence between Mr. W. Moore and Commissioner Bailey, *July 25*, 154, 155, 158.
- Potato Cultivation in West of Ireland—Progress made, *July 25*, 167.
- Shannon River Fisheries—Inquiry proposed, *July 31*, 964.
- Treasury Subventions to Ireland, *July 25*, 194.
- Western Districts, Work in, *July 25*, 166.
- Working of Department
  - Departmental Committee of Inquiry—Reports and Recommendations of, *July 25*, 160–163.
  - Statement, *July 25*, 160–171.

Russia
- Anglo-Russian Negotiations.
  - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *Aug. 1*, 1262; Mr. Lynch, 1294, 1295; Mr. Rees, 1301–1303; Sir E. Grey, 1318, 1319.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29*, 481, 482.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Snowden; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 30*, 765.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
- London Schools, Income of, *Aug. 6*, 1813.
- School Hygiene Congress, Invitations to, *July 25*, 140.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H.—*cont.*
- Egypt
  - Education
    - Arabic, Teaching of, *Aug. 1*, 1245.
    - University, Establishment of, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 1245.
  - Home Rule for, proposed, *Aug. 1*, 1247–1249.
  - Municipal Government, Extension of Principle, *Aug. 1*, 1246, 1314.
  - Public Libraries, Provision of, *Aug. 1*, 1246.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby.]
- Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 627.

St. Albans, Bishop of
- Training Colleges
  - Hostels, Decision as to, *July 25*, 72, 73.
  - New Regulations for—Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 67–74.
  - Trust Deeds, Responsibility for carrying out, *July 25*, 70.

St. Aldwyn, Viscount
- Lights on Vehicles Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 6; *Com.*, *July 30*, 712, 714.
- Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1173–1175.

St. Helena
- Flax Cultivation.
  - *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug.* 1, 1192, 1193.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 1*, 1207, 1208.
- Water Tax, Revenue from, etc.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July* 31, 951.

Salisbury, Bishop of
- Secondary Schools, New Regulations, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 82.

Salisbury, Marquess of
- Education
  - Elementary Schools, Provision of—Allocation of Grant. Legal and Constitutional Aspect of the Matter, *July 25*, 84.
  - Secondary Schools
    - Regulations, New, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 85, 86.
    - Trust Endowments, Responsibility of the Board of Education, *July 25*, 87, 88.
  - Training Colleges, New Regulations for, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 88–93.

[*cont.*

Salisbury, Marquess of—*cont.*
Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 9; *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1175.
Sugar—Brussels Convention, *Aug. 5*, 1503-1510.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill
c. 2R.* *July 30*, 920.
Com., *Aug. 2*, 1467.
*Rep.** *Aug. 2*, 1468.
Con. and 3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1688.

Salter, Mr. C. [Hampshire, Basingstoke]
Army—Disbanded Battalions, *July 29*, 473.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 585, 636, 647-650, 667, 672, 689.

Saltoun, Lord
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R., *Aug. 1*, 1145-1147, 1155.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorshire, Cleveland]
Colonial Governors, System of Appointing, *July 25*, 130.
Colonial Import Duty on Articles for the Forces, *July 25*, 129.
Employment of Women Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1465, 1466.
Panama Canal—Trinidad Labour, *July 25*, 129.
Transvaal
Asiatic Law Amendment Act, Administration of, *July 25*, 128.
Chinese Labour — Applications for Repatriation, *July 25*, 128.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
African Hut Tax, Amount of, *July 29*, 480.
Anticipatory Motions Committee Recommendations, *July 25*, 498.
Indian Rupees, Profit on Coining, *July 29*, 480, 481.
Radio-Telegraphic Convention, Ratification of, *July 30*, 841-848.

Saville's Crossing
Fatality at—Erection of Footbridge.
Q. Mr. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 30*, 744, 745.

Savings Banks
[*See also* Post Office Savings Bank *and titles* Army *and* Navy.]
Vote for, *July 31*, 1076; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

Schwann, Mr. C. D. [Cheshire, Hyde]
Hyde Postmen's Duties, *July 31*, 957.

Scientific Investigation
Vote for, *July 31*, 1066; *Aug. 1*, 1237.

Scotland
Secretary for—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
[*For* Particular Places, *see their names.*]

Scotland—*cont.*
Births, Deaths, and Marriages, *see those titles.*
Crofters, Vote for, *July 31*, 1062; *Aug. 1*, 1236.
Education, *see that title.*
Law Charges and Courts, Vote for, *July 31*, 1061; *Aug. 1*, 1236.
Superiors, Rating of.
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Aug. 6*, 1809.

Scott, Mr. A. H. [Ashton-under-Lyne]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 334.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
Army—Territorial Force Cavalry Training, etc., *July 29*, 463.
Small Landowners (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1900, 1901.
Telegraph Messengers, Employment of, when over age, *July 29*, 492, 493.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords Amendts., *July 30* 908-910.
Yeomanry Armament under New Scheme, *July 29*, 464.

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill
c. 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1457.
Com., *Rep.* and 3R.,* *Aug. 5*, 1688.
l. 1R.* *Aug. 6*, 1690.
Date of taking.
Qs. Mr. Younger, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 5*, 1547.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H. [Lambeth, Brixton]
London Legislative Measures, Time Alloted to, *July 29*, 497.

Secret Service
Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Secretary for Scotland
Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seddon, Mr. J. R. [Lancashire, S.W., Newton]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 343, 349.
- Colonial Preference, Policy of, *July 30*, 832.
- Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 832.
- Scottish Grand Committee, Obstruction in, *July 26*, 270, 271.

Seely, Major J. E. B. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
- Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 309, 315, 339.
- Coastguard, Reorganisation Proposals, *July 29*, 460.
- Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) (Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1362, 1363.
- Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1670.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendments, *July 30*, 904, 905.
- Yeomanry Armament under New Scheme, *July 29*, 464.

Selsey Water Bill
- *c. Con.* July 29*, 438.
  - 3R.* *Aug. 1*, 1184.
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.* Aug. 6*, 1689.

Session
- *See under* Parliamentary Procedure.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
- Belfast Dock Strike, Measures taken to cope with, *July 25*, 216, 217.
- Navy — Battleship Construction Programme, *July 31*, 1042.
- Nigeria—Railway Construction in the North, *Aug. 5*, 1534.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendments, *July 30*, 912.

Shannon River
- Fisheries—Inquiry proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 31*, 964.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
- Ground Game Act—Application to Crofters, *July 31*, 962.
- Small Landholders' (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1890, 1891, 1893–1898, 1926, 1927.
- Superiors, Rating of, *Aug. 6*, 1809.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
- Labourers Acts, Clause 19, Advances under, *July 31*, 970.
- Singleton Estate—Case of J. R. O'Sullivan, *July 29*, 446.
- Whitechurch—Case of J. Ambrose, *July 29*, 459.

Sheep
- Scottish Stocks, Valuation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Aug. 5*, 1545.

Sheffield, Sir B. [Yorkshire, W.R., Osgoldcross.]
- French Naval Stations in the Mediterranean, *Aug. 1*, 1191, 1206.
- Navy
  - Home Fleet—Readiness for Mobilisation, *July 31*, 947.
  - Portsmouth Review—Closing of Gunnery Establishments, etc., *July 31*, 946.
  - Torpedo-boat Destroyers, Time taken to complete, *July* 26, 241.

Sheffield Corporation Bill
- *l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.,* July 29*, 377.
  - Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Sheriff Courts (Scotland)
- Remuneration of Interim Sheriff Substitute, out of Moneys voted by Parliament.
  - *Resolution* [Mr. G. Whiteley], *July 29*, 696; Report, *July 30*, 919.
    - *O.* Mr. Younger, 696.

Sherwell, Mr. A. [Huddersfield]
- Naval Expenditure, *July 31*, 1048.

Shetland
- Herring Fisheries, Effect of Whale Fishing on.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 29*, 494, 495.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Wason, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 5*, 1546.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Aug. 5*, 1547.
- Norwegian Claims to, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *Aug. 5*, 1562, 1563.

Shoeburyness
- Land acquired by War Office.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 472, 473.
- Men Employed on Works.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 469, 470.

Shop Hours Act
- Return as to Closing Orders made in United Kingdom (1906–7) Presented, *July 30*, 740.

Shrove
- School Teacher, Payments to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 31*, 938, 939.

Sierra Leone
Report (1906) Presented, *July 29*, 383, 439.

Silver
Manufactured—Duty on, and Revenue from Licences during last Five Years.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 441, *July 31*, 935, 936.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
Ailsa Craig, Rating of, *Aug. 5*, 1545.
Congested District Board Powers, Extension of, proposed, *July 29*, 495.
Education—Grants in 1906-7, *July 25*, 112.
Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854, Reprint of, *Aug. 2*, 1381.
Lewis Island of
Balinakill Burial Ground, Site for, *July 31*, 963.
Cottars, Land Tenure of, *July 25*, 111.
Shader Landing Place, *July 31*, 963.
Stornoway—Carloway Road, Grant for, *July 31*, 963.
Poor Law—Case of E. Farrell, *Aug. 5*, 1546.
Ross-shire, Dog-Poisoning in, *July 31*, 963.
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1457; Date of Taking, *Aug. 5*, 1547.
Shetland Herring Fisheries, Effect of Whale Fishing on, *July 29*, 495; *Aug. 5*, 1546, 1547.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1853–1857, 1862, 1865, 1875, 1976, 1877.
Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1599–1602.
Rentals under £50, Inclusion of, *July 29*, 496.
Sutherlandshire, Dog-Poisoning in, *July 31*, 962.
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1458, 1460–1462, 1463.

Singleton Estate
Case of J. R. O'Sullivan.
Q. Mr. Sheehan: *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 446.

Sittings of the House
Long Sittings, Relief of Officials during.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 1*, 1230, 1231.
Saturday Sittings, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Flynn: *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 25*, 152.

Sligo
Condition of—Police Reports.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Aug. 5*, 1552.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Belfast
Constabulary Grievances—Threat of Strike, etc., *July 25*, 149; *Aug. 1*, 1228; *Aug. 6*, 1848.
Food Inspection System, *Aug. 1*, 1201.
Harbour Trust, *July 29*, 450.
Health Commission, Constitution of, *Aug. 1*, 1200.
Outworkers, Regulations as to, *July 25*, 116.
Constabulary—Case of T. M'Govern, *July 31*, 939.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 3R., *Aug. 2*, 1411-1414.
Malta—Marriage Fees, *Aug, 5*, 1518.
National School Teachers
Insurance of, *July 31*, 971, 972.
Junior Assistants. Work of, *July 31*, 938.
Shrove School Teacher, Payments to, *July 31*, 938.

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill
Administration, Cost of.
Q. Mr. E. Gardener; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 30*, 745, 746.
Allocation of Time—*Resolution* [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *Aug. 5*, 1663.
Allotted Days, 1666.
Dilatory Motions, Procedure as to, 1667.
New Clauses and Clauses 1–5, 1663, 1665.
Practice of fettering Discussion by Guillotine Resolutions, 1667–
Report Stage, 1663, 1665.
Third Reading Stage, 1663, 1666.
Existing Contracts, Effect on.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Aug. 1*, 1213, 1214.
Reprint of Bill showing Position of New Clauses, proposed.
Os. Mr. Cave, *Aug. 5*, 1664; Mr. Chaplin, 1664, 1665, 1670; Mr. Speaker, 1664, 1665; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1665, 1669, 1673; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1671; Mr. Mildmay, 1672; Mr. A. S. Wilson, 1672.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.
c. Report from Standing Committee, *July 30*, 785.
Con., *Aug. 6*, 1850.
Allocation of Time—*Resolution* [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *Aug. 5*, 1563.
Allotted Days, 1565, 1613–1615, 1628.
Clauses 7–15, 1565, 1627.
New Clauses and Clauses 1–6, 1565, 1577, 1607, 1608, 1615–1620, 1627.

[*cont.*

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
  Allocation of Time, etc.—*cont.*
    Practice of fettering Discussion by Guillotine Resolutions, 1566–1574, 1576, 1579, 1585, 1586, 1588, 1590–1594, 1596–1598, 1609.
    Report Stage, 1565, 1579, 1581, 1606–1612, 1627.
    Standing Committee, Discussion in, 1564, 1568-1571, 1576, 1579, 1583, 1584, 1587, 1595, 1599–1601, 1603–1606.
    Third Reading Stage, 1566, 1629.
  Debate on Consideration [Commons], *Aug. 6*, 1850.
    Compulsion put on Small Farmers to become Crofters, 1909, 1910, 1913, 1927.
    Crofters Acts
      Application of throughout Scotland, proposed, 1878–1930.
      Working of, Condition of Congested Districts, etc., 1884–1909, 1911, 1928.
    Diseases of Animals Acts, Retention of Powers of Board of Agriculture as to, proposed, 1850-1872.
    Dual Ownership, 1916, 1917, 1929.
    Forfeiture of Tenancy on Failure of Bequest or Non acceptance by Legatee, 1875–1878.
    Government Amendments, 1933, 1937, 1941.
    Purchase by Agreement, granting Powers for, proposed, 1873–1875.
  Rentals under £50, inclusion of, proposed.
    Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 29*, 496.
  Report Stage, Date of taking.
    Qs. Sir J. Dewar, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Younger; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 1*, 1230.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
  Burma—Eviction from Lanmadau, *Aug. 6*, 1820.
  Council of India Bill, 2R., *Aug. 5*, 1682: *Com.*, *Aug. 6*, 1971–1973.
  Naval Volunteers — Disbandment Proposals, *July 25*, 122, 123.

Smith, Mr. A. H. [Hertfordshire, Hertford]
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1901–1903.
    Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1615, 1618.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
  Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 314, 350, 354, 356, 358.
  Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 633–636, 639.
  Edalji Case — Proposals for further Inquiry, *Aug. 1*, 1189.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
  Russia, Terms of Agreement with, *July 30*, 765.

Solicitor-General
  Sir W. S. Robson.

Solicitor General for Ireland
  Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor General for Scotland
  Mr. A. Ure.

Soudan
  Egyptian Troops in.
    Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 132.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 25*, 1.
  c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* *Aug. 1*, 1184.
    Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1374.

Southend Water Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill.
  l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 237.

Southwark, Bishop of
  Congo Free State Administration, *July 29*, 424.
  Training Colleges, New Regulations for, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 77–82.

Speaker and Deputy Speaker, Rulings of
  Butter and Margarine Bill
    Amendments
      Out of Order, *July 26*, 355.
      Violating a Clause just agreed to, was not in Order, *July 26*, 318.
    Irrelevant Matter, *July 26*, 296, 297, 300, 304, 353.
  Correspondence read to the House must be read without Comment, *July 25*, 155, 158.
  Criminal Appeal Bill—Motion for Adjournment of Debate, *July 29*, 683, 684.
  Cromer, Lord, Grant to—Alleged Breach of Privilege by the House of Lords, *July 31*, 977, 978.
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill
    Adjournment of the House, Motion for, was not possible under the Resolution Governing Procedure, *July 29*, 559.
    Arguments Relative to Subject under Discussion, *July 29*, 502, 570.
    Irrelevant Matter, *July 29*, 510, 557.

[*cont.*

Speaker and Deputy Speaker, etc.—*cont.*
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill—*cont.*
    Letter could not be read without the General Assent of the House, *July 29*, 560.
    Motion to Recommit to Select Committee if Carried would end the Bill, *July 29*, 508.
  Interruptions to Debate, *Aug. 5*, 1635, 1636; *Aug. 6*, 1890.
  Irrelevant Matter, *July 31*, 1124; *Aug. 5*, 1636, 1637, 1638, 1643, 1644.
  New Clause to Bill could not be Moved without Notice, *Aug. 2*, 1456.
  Small Holdings and Allotments Bill
    Criticism of Guillotine Resolution must wait till Motion was taken as a Substantive Motion, *Aug. 5*, 1670.
    Reprint of Bill showing Position of New Clauses, proposed, *Aug. 5*, 1664, 1665, 1671.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time
    Discussion going back on the Main Discussion was out of Order, *Aug. 5*, 1607.
    Irrelevant Matter, *Aug. 5*, 1582.

Standing Committees
  See under Committees.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
  Bills—Printing to show what Parts have been Passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 399.
  Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1180.
  Education
    Elementary Schools, Provision of—Allocation of Grant, Legal and Constitutional Aspect of the Matter, *July 25*, 60, 61.
    Secondary Schools, New Regulations, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, *July 25*, 62.
    Training Colleges
      Hostels, Decision as to, *July 25*, 66.
      New Regulations for, Reasons for Reversal of Policy as to Religious Neutrality, etc., *July 25*, 62–67.
  Lights on Vehicles Bill, *Com.*, *July 30*, 711.

Starkey, Mr. J. R. [Notts, Newark]
  "Blake," H.M.S., Armament of, *July 25*, 123.
  Panama Canal—Trinidad Labour, *July 25*, 129; *July 30*, 762.

State Banking Corporation, Ltd.
  Prosecution, Decision as to.
    Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Aug. 1*, 1195.

Stationery and Printing
  Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Statute Law Revision Bill
  c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *July 26*, 376.

Staveley-Hill, Mr. H. [Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
  Irish Crown Prosecutions in 1907, *Aug. 6*, 1836.
  MacDonnell, Sir A., Cause of Irish Visit of, *Aug. 6*, 1837.
  New Hebrides Native Labour Inspection, *July 31*, 950.
  Panama Canal
    Jamaican Labour for, *Aug. 6*, 1823.
    Trinidad Labour Contract, *July 31*, 950.
  Secondary School Regulations, Changes in, *Aug. 6*, 1834.

Stewart, Mr. H. [Greenock]
  Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 308.

Stewart-Smith, Mr. D. [Westmoreland, Kendal]
  Kendal Telephone Exchange Charges, *July 29*, 493.

Stokes Estate
  Case of J. Monaghan.
    Q. Mr. C. MacVeigh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1221.

Strachey, Sir E.—*Treasurer of the Household* [Somerset, S.]
  Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, Arbitration under, *July 25*, 145.
  Burwell Farm—Compensation to Outgoing Tenant, *July 31*, 941.
  Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 298, 301, 308, 314, 315, 316, 318, 319, 326–330, 339, 350, 358, 359, 361–363.
  Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 2*, 1468.
  Sheep—Valuation of Scottish Stocks, *Aug. 5*, 1545.
  Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Cost of Administration, *July 30*, 746.
  Wimbledon Common, Public Rights on, *July 25*, 145.

Straits Settlements
  Federated Malay States, Gambling Dens in.
    Q. Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 475, 476.

Stuart, Mr. J. [Sunderland]
  Finance Bill, 3R., *July 30*, 828.

Sugar
  Brussels Covention
    Additional Act, Operation of.
      Q. Mr. Moore ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 5*, 1536.
    Colonies, Communications from
      Os. Earl of Denbigh, *Aug. 5*, 1497, 1498 ; Earl of Elgin, 1501, 1502.
    Draft Protocol, Terms of.
      Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Aug. 1*, 1212.
    Effect of and Government Decision as to.
      Os. Mr. B. Law, *Aug.* 1, 1240–1245 ; Sir E. Grey, 1305–1309 ; Earl of Denbigh, *Aug. 5*, 1489–1498 ; Lord Nunburnholme, 1498–1501 ; Earl of Elgin, 1501–1503 ; Marquess of Salisbury, 1503–1510 ; Lord Fitzmaurice, 1510–1512.
    Indian Representations, Circulation of.
      Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson ; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 31*, 949.
    Representations from Chambers of Commerce.
      Q. Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 6*, 1824.
  Duty
    Abolition of, proposed.
      Os. Mr. Byles, *July 30*, 799 ; Mr. P. Pease, 800, 801 ; Mr. Everett, 803 ; Mr. L. Harris, 809.
    Irish Contribution.
      Q. Mr. Gwynn ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 442.

Sugar Beet
  Cultivation. Proposals for Encouraging.
    Q. Mr. Fell ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31*, 956.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
  Naval Dockyards—Wages, Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1025–1027.
  Sittings of the House—Relief of Officials during Long Sittings, *Aug. 1*, 1230–1231.

Sunderland Corporation Bill
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 29*, 438.
  l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Superannuation Act
  Army and Navy Officers permitted to hold Civil Appointments — Return Presented, *July 29*, 384, 439.

Supply
  [*See also titles* Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, Navy Estimates.]
  Grant from Consolidated Fund towards making good — £72,563,714, *Com.** *July 31*, 1089 ; *Rep.** *Aug. 1*, 1345.

Supply—*cont.*
    Votes Closured in Classes, *July 31*, 1052, 1057, 1061, 1665, 1071, 1075, 1079, 1083 ; *Aug. 1*, 1320, 1323, 1327, 1331, 1333, 1337, 1341.

Surveys
  Vote for, *July 31*, 1052 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Sutherland, Mr. J. E. [Elgin, Burghs]
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Date of taking Report Stage, *Aug. 1*, 1230.

Sutherlandshire
  Dog Poisoning in.
    Qs. Mr. Morton ; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 31*, 962.

Swansea
  Education Dispute—Present Position.
    Qs. Lord R. Cecil ; *As.* Mr. Lough, *Aug. 6*, 1834, 1835.

Swansea Harbour Bill
  l. *Rep.** *July 29*, 377.
    3R.* *Aug. 5*, 1469.

Swaythling, Baron
  Introduced to House of Lords. *Aug. 1*, 1137.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]
  Factory and Workshop Bill, 2R., *Avg. 6*, 1998.
  Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *Aug. 5*, 1540.

Tallow
  Case of M Cleary.
    Q. Mr. O'Shee ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 5*, 1527.

Tarbert (Ireland)
  Railway Extension to, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug.* 6, 1815, 1816.

Taxation
  Broadening Basis of, proposed.
    Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 30*, 788, 791 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 826, 827.
  Income Tax, *see that title.*
  Local
    Account — Return (1906–7) Ordered, *Aug. 2*, 1376.
    Licence Duties, etc.—Return (1906–7) Ordered, *July 25*, 108.
  Return as to Rates of Duties, Taxes or Imposts Collected by Imperial Officers, Presented, *July 31*, 933.

Taylor, Mr. J. W. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
  Chester-le-Street Vaccination Exemption Cases, *July 25*, *138*.

Tea
Duty—Irish Contribution.
Q. Mr. Gwynn ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 29*, 442.
Indian—Russian Imports.
Q. Mr. H. Cox ; Mr. Morley, *July 25*, 118.

Tees Conservancy Bill
c. *Con.** *July 25*, 106.
3R.* *July 29*, 438.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con., July 31*, 925.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Telegraph (Construction Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *July 29*, 695.

Telegraph (Money) Bill
c. 3R. *July 26*, 365.
l. 1R.* *July 29*, 384.
2R. *July 30*, 714.
3R* *July 31*, 931.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.
Expenditure Projected under.
Qs. Mr. Bowles ; Mr. Runciman, *July 25*, 134.

Telegraph Service
[*See also names of places.*]
Messengers, Employment of when over age.
Qs. Sir. S. Scott ; *As.* Captain Morton, Mr. Speaker, *July 29*, 493.
Subsidies, Vote for, *July 31*, 1072 ; *Aug. 1*, 1238.

Telephone Service
[*See also names of places.*]
National Telephone Company Agreements, Stamp Duty on.
Q. Mr. Mallet ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 25*, 117.
Provincial Charges, Revision of.
Q. Mr. Mallet ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 29*, 440.

Temporary Commissions
Vote for, *July 31*, 1079 ; *Aug.* 1, 1238.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con., July 30*, 889.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.
Lords' Amendments, Date of Considering.
Qs. Mr. Byles ; Mr. Ashley ; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 29*, 496, 497.

Thames
Minefields and Guns, Information as to.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. Ashley ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 474.

Thompson, Mr. [Somersetshire, E.]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con., July 26*, 348.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
Police Action at Anti-Russian Demonstration, *July 30*, 772.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
Aliens, Deportation of, *Aug. 5*, 1518.

Tobacco
Cultivation in Ireland, Encouragement of, proposed.
Os. Mr. W. Redmond, *July 25*, 196.
Trusts, Proposals for dealing with.
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 30*, 745.

Trade, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. H. E. Kearley.
Bankruptcy Department, Vote for, *July 31*, 1057 ; *Aug. 1*, 1235.
Journal, Lessening Price of, proposed.
Os. Mr. S. Roberts, *Aug. 1*, 1296.

Trade Report
Annual Series, Presented, *July 25*, 4, 108 ; *July 26*, 240 ; *July 29*, 383, 440 ; *July 31*, 926, 933 ; *Aug. 1*, 1185.
Miscellaneous Series Presented, *July 31*, 933.

Trade and Commerce
Capital, Movements of.
Q. Mr. C. Money ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 29*, 487.
Irish Trade Statistics, *see under* Ireland.

Trafalgar Square
Shrubs, &c., for.
Q. Mr. Alden ; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Aug. 6*, 1809, 1810.

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 30*, 738.
l. Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Transvaal
Asiatic Law Amendment Act, Administration of.
Q. Mr. Cox ; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 25*, 128.
British Civil Servants, Position of.
Q. Sir G. Parker ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 764.
British Indians, Position of.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson, Sir H. Cotton ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug 5*, 1533, 1534.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour
Repatriation, Applications for.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. H Samuel, *July 25*, 128.
Transvaal Debate—Publication of Speeches in Blue Book.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 475.
Fitzpatrick, Sir P.—Attack on Under-Secretary.
Q. Mr. McNeill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 971.
Liquor Supply to Natives—Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Churchill. *July 29*, 478.
Loan of £5,000,000
Application of.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 5*, 1531.
Bill, Date of Introducing.
Qs. Mr. E. Cecil, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 25*, 152, 153.
Papers, Date of Laying.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 5*, 1531, 1532.
Transvaal Bill, Contents of.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 29*, 475.
Mines—Native Labour Supply.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness, Sir G. Parker, Mr. B. Law; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 29*, 476-478.
Money outstanding on Old Loan.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 743.
Officials transferred to, Position of.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 763, 764.
White Labour in Mines, Restrictions on.
Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 30*, 760.

Trawling
See under Fisheries.

Treasurer of the Household
Sir E. Strachey.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Runciman.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1235.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W.R., Elland]
Government Department Contracts—Procedure in Cases of Dispute, *July 29*, 450.
Holme Lacy—Administration of Scudamore Charity, *July 31*, 943.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P.—*cont.*
Home Office Contracts, Alterations in, *July 31*, 934.
Works Board Contracts — Additional Clause, *July 29*, 455.
Wrexham Parochial Charities Scheme, *July 30*, 778.

Trustee Savings Banks
Returns (1905-6), Presented, *July 26*, 240.

Tuberculosis
Royal Commission—Appendix to Report, Presented, *Aug. 2*, 1376; *Aug. 5*, 1470.

Turkey
Basra, Freight Rates to.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 25*, 130.
Trade Report, Presented, *July 29*, 383.

Turnour, Viscount [Sussex, Horsham]
Army
Scots Greys, Accommodation for, *July 30*, 753, 754.
Tidworth Barracks Accommodation, *July 25*, 126.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 590. 617-619.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 29*, 547.
Magistrates Appointed since 1906, *July 25*, 152.
Militia Recruiting, Date of stopping, *July 25*, 125.
"Terrible," H.M.S.—Damage and Repairs, *July 25*, 122.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendts., *July 30*, 913.
Yeomanry Training, Proposals, *July 29*, 464.

Tweedmouth, Lord—*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
All British Route to the East, Scheme for, *July 30*, 727.
Australia, Naval Vessels for, proposed, *July 25*, 727.
Bills—Printing to show what parts have been passed by means of the Closure, proposed, *July 29*, 399.
Colonial Contributions, *July 30*, 725-727.
Colonial Reserves, Progress made with Enrolment of, *July 25*, 728.
Leith Burgh Order Confirmation Bill, 3R.; *Aug. 1*, 1154.
Reserve, Strength of, *July 30*, 728, 729.
Vaccination (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 1*, 1169.

Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 29*, 377.
Royal Assent, *Aug. 2*, 1373.

Uganda
Railway Annuities.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Aug. 6,* 1824.

Unemployed
Central Body, Circulation of Resolutions of.
Q. Mr. Carr-Gomm; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 1,* 1215.
Exchange Registries—Attitude towards Labour Disputes.
Q. Mr. Carr-Gomm; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 1,* 1215.
Grant, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31,* 956.
Qs. Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Aug. 6,* 1833, 1834.
Work provided for.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31,* 956.

United Methodist Church Bill
l. Royal Assent, *July 26,* 238.

United States
Finance, 1906—Report, Presented, *July 25,* 4.
Import Duty on British Works of Art.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 29,* 483.
Trade Report, Presented, *July 29,* 383.

University Colleges
Grants, Report on.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 31,* 953.

Upton Estate
Sale of and Reinstatements on.
Q. Sir W. Nugent; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 25,* 146.

Ure, Mr. A.—*Solicitor-General for Scotland* [Linlithgow]
Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con., July 26,* 310, 351-355.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con., Aug. 6,* 1878, 1880, 1881.

Vaccination Bill
c. Con. and 3R.* *July 26,* 376.
l. 1R.* *July 29,* 385.
2R., *Aug. 1,* 1181.

Vaccination (Scotland) Bill
l. 2R., *Aug. 1,* 1157.

Valuation of Lands (Scotland) Act 1854
Copy Ordered, *Aug. 2,* 1376.

Vehicles
Licences for Farmer's Conveyances.
Q. Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 25,* 133.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Buckinghamshire, N.]
Motors, Noise and Smell from, *Aug. 1,* 1199.

Vincent, Colonel Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
Consols, Decline in, *Aug. 6,* 1828.
Daily Graphic, Picture of 26 inst., *July 30,* 780.
Newfoundland Fishery Negotiations with United States, *Aug. 6,* 1828.
Parliamentary Reports, Form of publishing, *July 30,* 778.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords Amendts., *July 30,* 893.

Vivian, Mr. H. [Birkenhead]
Naval Dockyards
Private Yards, Allocation of Work to, *July 31,* 1033.
Wages—Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31,* 1034.

Volunteers
Naval—*see under* Navy.
Scottish, Railway Arrangements for conveyance of.
Q. Mr. Gulland; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29,* 471.
Vote for, *July 31,* 1085; *Aug. 1,* 1239.

Voters' Lists
Revising Barristers, Payment of.
Q. Mr. Cowan; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Aug. 5,* 1520.

Wallace Collection
Vote for, *July 31,* 1066; *Aug. 1,* 1237.

Walpole House Farm
Rent and Size of Holdings.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *Aug. 1,* 1220.

Walton, Sir J. L.—*Attorney-General* [Leeds, S.]
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con., July 29,* 587, 591, 592, 609, 620-622, 625, 633, 637-639, 650, 656, 665, 669, 670, 673, 674, 677, 678, 679, 680, 687, 689, 690.
Imprisonment for Debt, Legislative Proposals for dealing with, *July 29,* 494.
Merionethshire Teachers, Salaries of, *Aug. 5,* 1648-1651.
Patents—Appeals awaiting hearing, *July 31,* 962.
Peerages—Traffic in Titles, Publication of, *July 25,* 144, 145.
Police, Metropolitan—Case of G. Deed, *Aug. 6,* 1808.
Worcester Election Petition Prosecutions, *July 29,* 494.

War Office

Secretary of State — Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Parliamentary Under-Secretary — Earl of Portsmouth.

Financial Secretary — Mr. T. R. Buchanan.

Australian Meat Packing Establishment, Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1516.

Boot Contracts—Evasion of Price, Statement of Mr. Asquith.
Q. Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 6*, 1818.

Contracts

Meyer & Stepney, Messrs., Fines paid by.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 25*, 125.

Number placed in Wales.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 30*, 752; *Aug, 6*, 1818, 1819.

French Polishers, Female, Employment of.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 2*, 1383.

Marquee and Tent Contracts, Investigations into.
Q. Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 447.

Vote for, *July 31*, 1085; *Aug. 1*, 1240.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]

Naval Dockyard Wages — Payment of Trade Union Rate, *July 31*, 1036, 1037.

Wardle, Mr. G. J. [Stockport]

Railways—Use of Tank Engines by London and North Western Company, *July 30*, 775.

Warner, Mr. S. C. T. [Stafford, Lichfield]

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1858.

Warrenford Estate

Owner of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug.* 1, 1200.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]

Caithness and Orkney Postal Mail Delays, *July 29*, 492.

Coastguard Re-organisation Proposals, *July 29*, 460.

Congested District Board Powers, Extension of, *July 29*, 495.

Wason, Mr. J. C.—*cont.*

Gateshead Motor Driving Prosecution, *Aug. 5*, 1538.

Nigeria

Drink Traffic in, *Aug. 5*, 1536.

Southern — Railway Rates, *Aug. 1*, 1209.

Orkney Mail Boat, Ports of Call, *Aug. 5*, 1538.

Shetland

Herring Fisheries, Effect of Whale-fishing on, *July 29*, 494; *Aug. 5*, 1546, 1547.

Norwegian Claims to, *Aug. 5*, 1562.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Inclusion of Rentals under £50, *July 29*, 496.

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1462.

Wick and Thurso Postal Mail Delays, *Aug. 5*, 1539.

Waterford Asylum

Superintendent's Powers as to Exclusion of certain Newspapers.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Aug. 1*, 1223, 1224.

Waterlow, Mr. D. S. [Islington, N.]

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.,) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1945, 1954, 1963.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow College]

Admiralty Clothing Contracts, Allocation of, *July 25*, 112.

Colonial Governors, System of Appointing, *July 25*, 130.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1442.

Weardale, Lord

Leeds (South Parade Chapel) Charity Bill, 2R., *July 25*, 8, 10; *Com.*, *Aug. 1*, 1177.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyme]

Brunei, Money Lent to, *July 30*, 761, 762.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords' Amendments, *July 30*, 908.

War Office Contracts — Fines paid by Messrs. Meyer and Stepney, *July 25*, 125.

Wei-hai-Wei

Annual Report, Presented, *Aug. 6*, 1806.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
India—Estate Schools in Eastern Bengal, etc., *Aug. 1*, 1199.
Lewis, Island of
  Balinakill Burial Ground, Site for, *July 31*, 963.
  Cottars, Land Tenure of, *July* 25, 111.
  Shader Landing Place, *July 31*, 963.
  Stornoway-Carloway Road, Grant for, *July 31*, 962.
Public Health Acts—Complaints against Local Councils, *Aug. 1*, 1196.
Ross-shire, Dog-poisoning in, *July 31*, 963.

Wemyss, Earl of
Lights on Vehicles Bill, *Com., July 30*, 708.

Western Australia
Treatment of Natives in.
  Qs. Mr. McKean, *Aug. 1*, 1276, 1278.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill
c. Rep., July 25*, 107.
  Con., July 31*, 932.
  3R.,* *Aug. 5*, 1513.
l. Commons Amendts. *Con.,* Aug. 6*, 1689.

Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill
c. 2R., *Aug. 2*, 1458.
  Com., Aug. 6, 1987.
Expenses Resolution.
  Qs. Mr. Morton, *Aug. 6*, 1987, 1989; Mr. Whiteley, 1987; Lord R. Cecil, 1987, 1990; Mr. Rawlinson, 1987; Mr. J. A. Pease, 1988; Mr. A. Douglas, 1989.

Wheat, etc.
Duty, Revenue from.
  Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 25*, 117, 118.

Whitbread, Mr. S. H. [Hunts, Huntingdon]
Africa, South—Accommodation erected for Garrison since the War, *July 30*, 746.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1114–1116.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Ailsa Craig, Rating of, *Aug. 5*, 1545.
Education—Grants in 1906–7, *July 25*, 111.
Import Duties on Colonial Goods, *July 31*, 954.
Loch Long Torpedo Range, *Aug. 1*, 1205, 1207.
Northern Lights Commissioners — Land Purchase since 1890, *July 25*, 115.

White, Mr. L. [Yorks, E.R., Buckrose]
Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill, *Con., Aug. 6*, 1946, 1949, 1961.

Whitechurch
Reinstatement Claim of J. Ambrose.
  Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 29*, 459.

Whitefield
Ranelagh Foundation, Case of.
  Qs. Mr. E. Gardner; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 25*, 142, 143.
  Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 31*, 958.

Whitehead, Mr. R. [Essex, S.E.]
Shoeburyness Land acquired by War Office and Men employed on Works, *July 29*, 469, 472.
Vehicles used by Farmers, Licenses for, *July 25*, 133.

Whiteley, Mr. G., *Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury* [Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey].
Council of India Bill, *Com., Aug. 6*, 1981.
Criminal Appeal Bill, *Con., July 29*, 640, 661.
Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 695.
Irish Council Bill, 2R., *July 29*, 694.
Sheriffs Courts, Scotland—Remuneration of interim Sheriff Substitute out of Moneys Voted by Parliament, *July 29*, 696.
Supply—Application of Surpluses to meet Deficiencies, *July 30*, 923; *July 31*, 1134.
Whale Fisheries (Scotland) Bill—Expenses Resolution, *Aug. 6*, 1987.

Wick and Thurso
Postal Mail Delays during Tourist Season.
  Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Capt. Norton, *Aug. 5*, 1539.

Wicklow
Parliamentary Election—New Member Sworn for Wicklow (East), *Aug. 2*, 1374.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire].
Merionethshire Teachers, Salaries of, *Aug. 5*, 1645.

Williams, Mr. W. L. [Carmarthen District]
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Deduction for Propelling Power Bill, *Com., Aug. 1*, 1365, 1366.

Williamson, Mr. A. [Elgin and Nairn]

Grantown-on-Spey Telephone Service, *Aug. 1*, 1217.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]

Butter and Margarine Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 313.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. (Yorks, E.R., Holderness]

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1672.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1590–1592.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth]

Opium—Chinese Import Restrictions, *July 29*, 457.

Wilson, Mr. W. T. [Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton]

Birmingham—Pay of Post Office Wiremen *July 31*, 935.

Naval Dockyard Joiners—Rate of Pay, *July 31*, 1038-1040.

Post Office Letter Boxes, Painting of, *Aug. 6*, 1807.

Wimbledon Common

Public Right of holding Meetings on.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Sir E. Strachey *July 25*, 145.

Wireless Telegraphy

Radio-Telegraphic Convention, Ratification of—Opportunity for Discussion of Report of Committee.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, *July 30*, 841–848; Mr. Gwynn, 848–854, 857; Mr. Haldane, 854–858; Sir G. Parker, 857.

Wisbech Water Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Wood, Mr. T. M. [Glasgow, St. Rollox]

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, &c.) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1964.

Wood and Forests Office

Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Woolwich Arsenal

Chapman, *v.*, Case of.
Q. Mr. L. Harris; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Aug. 5*, 1517.

Woolwich Arsenal—*cont.*

Discharges
Bonus, Payment of.
Qs. Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 31*, 948.
Discussion, Opportunity for.
Qs. Mr. Crooks; *As.* Sir. H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Aug. 1*, 1231, 1232.

Minimum Establishment, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 25*, 123-125.

Worcester

Election Petition—Prosecutions undertaken.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease, Mr. MacNeil; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 29*, 494.

Workmen's Compensation Act, 1905

Expenses, Vote for, *July 31*, 1080; *Aug. 1*, 1239.

Works Board

Contracts, Clause added to.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 29*, 455.

Irish—*See under* Ireland.

Works and Buildings Office

Vote for, *July 31*, 1058; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Works Loan Commission

Vote for, *July 31*, 1057; *Aug. 1*, 1236.

Worthing Gas Bill

l. Royal Assent, *July 26*, 238.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam]

Motors, Noise and Smell from, *Aug. 1*, 1198.

Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, *Con.*, *July 26*, 371, 375.

Telegraph (Money) Bill, 3R., *July 26*, 367.

Wrexham

Parochial Charities Scheme.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *July 30*, 778.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, 2R., *July 31*, 1111–1114.

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill—Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1667.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Lords Amendments, *July 30*, 894, 895, 902–904.

Yeomanry
Armament under New Scheme.
Qs. Major Seely, Sir S. Scott ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 464.
Training Proposals.
Q. Viscount Turnour ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 29*, 464.
Vote for, *July 31*, 1084 ; *Aug. 1*, 1239.

York (Micklegate Strays Bill
c. Rep. July 25*, 107.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]
Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854, Reprint of, *Aug. 2*, 1381.
Militia Billeting Liabilities of Scottish Counties, *July 29*, 472.
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) (Application of Penalties) Bill, Date of taking, *Aug. 5*, 1547.

Younger, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Sheriff Courts—Remuneration of Interim Sheriff Substitute out of Moneys Voted by Parliament, *July 29*, 696.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *Aug. 6*, 1875, 1877.
Allocation of Time, *Aug. 5*, 1607.
Date of taking Report Stage, *Aug. 1*, 1230.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]
Broughton School Staff, *July 25*, 111.
Merionethshire School Teachers' Salaries, *July 31*, 959 ; *Aug. 5*, 1656.

Zanzibar
Administration of.
Qs. Sir C. Hill, *Aug. 1*, 1300.
Slavery on Coast Strip, Abolition of.
Qs. Sir C. Hill, Mr. P. Pease ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 31*, 952, 953.